

**A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE CO-RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
NIETZSCHE'S CONCEPT OF MORAL RELATIVISM AND SAME-SEX
SEXUAL RELATIONSHIP AS A CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISSUE.**

LUSABE LENNOXIE NAFUMA

**A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate School in Fulfilment of the Requirements for
the Award of Masters of Arts Degree in Philosophy of Chuka University.**

**CHUKA UNIVERSITY
OCTOBER, 2024**

DECLARATION AND RECOMMENDATION

Declaration

This Thesis is my original work and has not been previously presented for the award of a degree or conferment of a diploma in this or any other University.

Signature..........Date.....7/10/2024.....
Lusabe Lennoxie Nafuma
AM/22/58028/22

Recommendation

This Thesis has been examined, passed and submitted with our approval as University Supervisors.

Signature..........Date.....07/10/2024.....
Dr. Jonathan Kathenge
Chuka University.

Signature..........Date.....07/10/2024.....
Dr. Martin Wamalwa
Chuka University.



COPYRIGHT
©2024

All rights reserved. No part of this thesis may be reproduced by means of mechanical, including, photocopying, recording or any information retrieval system without permission in writing from the author or Chuka University.

DEDICATION

To my father (RIP), and my mum Joina Nasambu in whose wisdom I share, and to all those who still believe there is objectivity in evaluation of moral standards of a society.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, gratitude to God who gave me life and nourishes me with his wisdom. I want to express my profound gratitude to my advisors, Dr. Jonathan Kathenge and Dr. Martin Wamalwa, for their constant support, wise direction, and precious feedback during my research. Their knowledge and encouragement have significantly shaped this work. I also extend my thanks to my colleagues and peers whose collaborative spirit and helpful discussions enriched this study. Special thanks to Chuka University for providing the essential resources and atmosphere for conducting my research. Finally, a heartfelt thanks to my family, confreres and friends for their unwavering encouragement and understanding throughout this journey.

ABSTRACT

This research delves deeply into the profound ways in which Friedrich Nietzsche's ideas on moral relativism influence contemporary perspectives on sexual morality, paying particular attention to same-sex relationships. By thoroughly exploring Nietzsche's philosophical concepts, the study meticulously dissects the intricate complexities inherent in moral discussions and the quest for personal freedom. Through an exhaustive analysis, it contrasts Nietzsche's radical thoughts with long-standing traditional moral values, illustrating how his ground-breaking ideas have significantly reshaped modern perspectives and legal frameworks surrounding same-sex relationships. In its scope, the research investigates a wide range of cultural and regional viewpoints, thus emphasizing the global significance and diverse interpretations of Nietzsche's philosophy. The study rigorously addresses potential criticisms and practical challenges associated with applying Nietzsche's relativism to modern moral debates, offering a balanced and comprehensive analysis. This nuanced examination aims to enrich the broader conversation on morality, fostering deeper critical thinking. Additionally, the research delves into historical contexts to illustrate how Nietzsche's philosophy interacted with and sometimes clashed with the established norms of his time, compared to its reception in today's world. It also examines the legal implications of Nietzschean thought on policies and frameworks concerning same-sex relationships across various societies. The study employs historical method complimented by phenomenological method to draw a comparison between Nietzsche's moral relativism and same-sex relationships as an example of an ethical issue requiring detailed insight through the use of both the philosophical-historical method and the phenomenological approach. The study underscores the importance of understanding these philosophical underpinnings to fully appreciate modern views on sexual morality. It not only aims to highlight Nietzsche's influence but also seeks to engage readers in a reflective dialogue about the nature and evolution of moral judgments. By doing so, it aspires to contribute meaningfully to ongoing discussions about equality, acceptance, and the ever-evolving standards of what constitutes moral behaviour in contemporary times. Through this ambitious scholarly endeavour, the research aims to spark continued interest and dialogue in Nietzschean philosophy and its application to today's moral and ethical landscape. Moreover, the study extends its analysis to a broader spectrum, exploring different dimensions and implications of Nietzsche's moral relativism across various facets of modern life. This approach not only enriches the understanding of Nietzsche's philosophy but also emphasizes its enduring impact on the ongoing debates about sexual morality, legal rights, and societal responses to same-sex relationships.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION AND RECOMMENDATION	ii
COPY RIGHT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	v
ABSTRACT.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS.....	xi
CHAPTER ONE:INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	5
1.3 The Purpose of the Study.....	5
1.4 Research Objectives.....	6
1.5 Research Questions.....	6
1.6 Significance of the Study	6
1.7 Scope of the Study	7
1.8 Limitation and Delimitations of the Study.....	8
1.9 Assumptions of the Study	9
CHAPTER TWO:LITERATURE REVIEW.....	10
2.1 Nietzsche’s Concept of Moral Relativism	10
2.1.1 Critique of Traditional Values	11
2.1.2 Master-Slave Morality	13
2.1.3 Will-to-Power	16
2.2 Contemporary Moral Issues: Same-Sex Sexual Relationships.....	18
2.2.1 Historical Context	19
2.2.2 Modern Ethical Perspectives.....	19
2.3 Intersection of Nietzsche’s Moral Relativism and Same-Sex Relationships.....	20
2.3.1 Relativistic Moral Frameworks.....	21
2.3.2 Critique of Religious and Traditional Moral Values	21

2.3.3 The Will-to-Power and Sexual Autonomy	22
2.4 Criticisms and Counterarguments.....	22
2.4.1 Criticisms of Moral Relativism.....	23
2.4.2 Nietzschean Response.....	23
2.5 Theoretical Framework.....	24
CHAPTER THREE:RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	27
3.1 Location of the Study.....	27
3.2 Research Design.....	28
3.3 Data Collection	28
3.4 Data Analysis	29
3.5 Method of Analysis.....	30
3.5.1 Textual Analysis	30
3.5.2 Theoretical Application	30
3.5.3 Interdisciplinary Integration.....	30
3.5.4 Synthesis of Findings	31
3.5.4 Historical and Phenomenological Philosophical Methods	31
3.6 Ethical Considerations	32
CHAPTER FOUR:AN ANALYSIS OF NIETZSCHE’S MORAL RELATIVISM. 34	
4.1 General Understanding of Moral Relativism.....	34
4.1.1 Moral Objectivism	35
4.1.2 Nietzsche’s Relativistic Morality.....	36
4.1.3 Beyond Moral Relativism	38
4.2. Nietzsche’s Philosophy: Beyond Nihilism	39
4.2.1 Nietzsche’s Nihilism.....	39
4.2.2 Beyond Nihilism	41
4.3. Critiques and Various Interpretations of Nietzsche’s Moral Relativism.....	43
4.3.1 Subjectivism and the Creation of Values.....	43
4.3.2 Moral Objectivity and Will-to-Power.....	44
4.3.3 Master and Slave Morality.....	45

4.3.4 Ethical Nihilism and the Danger of Relativism	46
4.3.5 The Concept of the Übermensch.....	46
4.3.6 Potential Misinterpretations of Nietzsche’s Thought	46
4.3.7 Concluding Remarks.....	47

**CHAPTER FIVE: SAME-SEX SEXUAL RELATIONS AS A CONTEMPORARY
MORAL ISSUE..... 49**

5.1 Historical Overview of Same-sex Relations	49
5.1.1 Ancient Times	49
5.1.2 The Middle Ages.....	50
5.1.3 Early Modern Period.....	51
5.1.4 19 th and Early 20 th Centuries.....	52
5.1.5 Mid to Late 20 th Century.....	52
5.2 Legal Stances	53
5.2.1 Global Legal Stances on Same-sex Relations.....	53
5.2.2 Same-sex Relations: Kenyan Situation	56
5.3 Catholic Church Stances on Same-sex Relations	62
5.3.1 Same-sex Relations in Christian Tradition	62
5.3.2 The Catholic Church in Kenya	65
5.3.3 Contemporary Challenges and Debates on Same-Sex Marriage in the Catholic Church.....	67
5.3.4 A Link between Same-Sex Sexual Relations with The Contemporary Problem of the Sexual Abuse of the Minors especially Boys.	69
5.4 Nietzsche’s moral relativism applied to Same-Sex Relationships.....	70
5.5 Universal Principles of Moral Objectivism	71
5.5.1 Human Dignity and Autonomy.....	72
5.5.2 Equality and Non-Discrimination	72
5.5.3 Promotion of Well-being and Harm Prevention	73
5.6 Conclusion	74

CHAPTER SIX:PROPOSITION FOR MORAL OBJECTIVISM	76
6.1 Moral Objectivism	76
6.1.1 Defining Moral Objectivism	76
6.1.2 Core Principles of Moral Objectivism	77
6.2 Logical Argument against Moral Relativism.....	78
6.2.1 Contradiction in Universal Tolerance	78
6.2.2 Inability to Condemn Atrocities.....	80
6.2.3 Moral Progress and Reform	82
6.2.4 Inter-Cultural Criticism.....	83
6.2.5 Shared Moral Values.....	85
6.2.6 Practical Implications.....	86
6.2.7 Self-Refutation	88
6.3 Application of Moral Objectivism to Same-Sex Relationship	90
6.3 Negative Implications of Same-sex Relations to Human Society	90
6.3.1 Social Cohesion and Traditional Values	90
6.3.2 Population Growth and Demographics	91
6.3.3 Psychological and Emotional Well-being.....	91
6.4 Conclusion	92
CHAPTER SEVEN:SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	94
7.1 Summary	94
7.2 Research Findings.....	96
7.2.1 Introduction.....	96
7.2.2 Key Findings	97
7.3 Recommendations.....	104
BIBLIOGRAPHY Books.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
APPENDICES.....	126
Appendix I:.....	126

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AD	:	Anno domini (after Christ)
CCC	:	Catechism of the Catholic Church
CDC	:	Centre for Disease Control and Prevention
CDF	:	Congregation of the Doctrine of Faith
CF	:	Confer
CI	:	Categorical Imperative
Etc.	:	Et Cetera
DDF	:	Dicastery of the Doctrine of Faith
GALCK	:	Gay and Lesbian Coalition of Kenya
HIV/AIDS	:	Human immunodeficiency virus infection and acquired immune deficiency syndrome
LGBTQ	:	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer
NACOSTI	:	National Council for Science, Technology and Innovation
n.d	:	No date
NGLHRC	:	National Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission
NGO	:	Non-Governmental-Organization
RSIS	:	Research Scientific Innovation Society
UDHR	:	Universal Declaration of Human Rights
USA	:	United States of America
UNAIDS	:	Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The philosophical teachings of Friedrich Nietzsche have long been a focal point for extensive debate and rigorous analysis. Nietzsche's radical perspective on the dismissal of established moral frameworks, coupled with his advocacy for an individualistic approach to ethics, remain some of the most polarizing subjects within the realm of philosophy (Badey, 2012). At the crux of Nietzsche's ethical philosophy lies the concept of moral relativism, which posits that universal moral truths do not exist (Nietzsche, 1887). Instead, it asserts that moral values are profoundly shaped by cultural, historical, and personal contexts, thus denying the possibility of a singular, overarching moral code that applies to all.

In key works like *Beyond Good and Evil* (Nietzsche 1966) and *On the Genealogy of Morality* (Nietzsche 1997), Nietzsche scrutinizes the bedrock of prevailing ethics. He claims that accepted moral orders, be it from religious or Enlightenment roots, are creations that benefit certain social segments. His viewpoint disputes the notion of timeless ethical standards, asserting that moral principles are subjective and arise from particular historical and societal contexts. Thus, Nietzsche's analysis offers a profound critique of perceived moral objectivity.

Nietzsche presents the divide between master and slave morality in "On the Genealogy of Morality." Master morality values traits like strength and nobility, whereas slave morality develops from those suffering, turning pain into virtues like humility and kindness (Nietzsche, 1997). This separation highlights Nietzsche's belief that good and evil are not universal constants but are shaped by social standing and power dynamics. What one group views as good or evil can vastly differ from another's perspective.

At the core of Nietzsche's philosophical framework lies the concept of the overman, which he first presented in his work "*Thus Spoke Zarathustra*" (Nietzsche, 2006). The figure of the overman transcends conventional moral doctrines and establishes his own set of distinctive principles. This character symbolizes Nietzsche's profound desire for individuals to break free from the constraints of societal ethics and cultivate their own personally meaningful moral values. Nietzsche envisions the overman as a beacon for humanity, encouraging people to evolve beyond mere conformity and pursue a life imbued with self-determined significance.

The concept of the *Übermensch* complements contemporary views on individual autonomy in establishing personal morals. This perspective advocates for individuals deciding their sexuality and relationships without societal interference (Fraser, 2003). Nietzsche's support for unique values aligns with the acceptance of same-sex relationships. Embracing these views promotes community acceptance and understanding.

The influence of Nietzsche's ideas on the moral status of same-sex relationships is evident in the efforts of the LGBTQ community to reclaim and affirm their identities (Farr, 2018). These efforts are geared towards challenging and dismantling the cultural and moral narratives that have long marginalized them. This process of deconstructing heteronormative assumptions and asserting the legitimacy of non-heteronormative sexualities echoes Nietzsche's call for a critical reassessment and reformation of moral values, empowering individuals to create their own ethical paradigms.

Nietzsche's thorough examination of traditional ethical systems deeply questions the underlying reasons for criticizing same-sex relationships. He posits that these criticisms often originate from religious doctrines and conservative viewpoints. Nietzsche suggests that moral standards are constructed by humans and are not universal truths handed down from a higher authority. From this perspective, absolute moral judgments against same-sex relationships are brought into question, as their basis is shown to be subjective rather than objective. Consequently, the condemnation of same-sex relationships becomes less

justifiable within the framework that Nietzsche presents, challenging the validity of such absolute moral declarations.

Societal views on same-sex relationships have shifted greatly over time and across different cultures. In ancient Greece, such relationships were not only commonly accepted but also seen as significant for education and personal growth, a point highlighted by Dover in 1989. However, with the rise of Christianity, attitudes toward same-sex relationships underwent a dramatic change. They began to face condemnation and were subject to legal penalties, driven by prevailing religious beliefs that labelled these acts as sinful (Boswell, 1980). This shift illustrates the powerful influence of religion on societal norms and legal structures regarding sexual behaviour.

During the late 20th century and the early 21st century, there was a movement towards recognizing and embracing same-sex relationships, particularly within Western societies. This is evidenced by numerous countries that have implemented legal provisions for same-sex marriage, illustrating this change in societal norms (Badgett et al., 2010). However, substantial resistance still exists, mainly driven by conventional and religious factions that maintain the view that same-sex relationships are morally wrong. The ongoing conflict between contemporary viewpoints and entrenched traditional beliefs continues to be a prominent issue.

One major critique of Nietzsche's moral relativism is that it might lead to nihilism—rejecting all moral principles. This can cause moral confusion and social disorder (Reginster, 2006). This idea is particularly challenging when considering same-sex relationships. Deconstructing traditional morals without creating a new ethical consensus might result in social disunity and tension.

Additionally, applying Nietzsche's principles to contemporary debates about same-sex relationships underscores certain limitations inherent in the doctrine of moral relativism. It raises critical questions about the balance between individual freedoms and social cohesion. For instance, how can a community sustain itself without a set of universally

agreed-upon moral standards? What are the implications for societal sustainability when each person is at liberty to establish their own set of values? Doesn't this create cultural orthodox nihilism?

Contemporary society adapts Nietzsche's idea of Superman but seems to assert that Superman is not just an ideal postulation, but also, existentially tenable. In the contemporary society, for some, for a human being to be truly human, there should be no affirmation whatsoever of God as an infinite being. Indeed, for a man to be truly human, man must consequently dispense with the belief in God. (Masterson, 1965). Man, therefore, must be left to do whatever that pleases him. It would be an act of bad faith to try to justify or explain the paradox of existence by an appeal to a transcendent God. Instead of seeking futile speculation to explain and justify an unjustifiable world, we must seek rather to transform and improve it by the only tangible instrument of meaning and value at our disposal, namely, the human person (Masterson, 1965).

Nietzsche's moral relativism is epitomized in his theory of superman. A section of people in the contemporary society has embraced Nietzsche's "Superman" philosophy and has stretched it far beyond what Nietzsche himself contemplated. This has created a society that is hegemonic and pervasive. Hegemony and pervasiveness are manifested in the orthodox cultural nihilism—a culture which has human beings exalting freedom without accountability to the extent of embracing "alternative truths," which has consequently led to societal issues such as same sex sexual relationships (Leonard, 2018). The perpetuation of the notion of "alternative truths" in the area of morality is not only a danger to objective truths but also to the very existence of the society itself. In places like the USA (among the Caucasians) and some parts of Europe where they have tolerated the notion of alternative truths in the area of morality, the population is going down drastically. The stretching of the freedom of human beings without responsibility in moral affairs, has brought about contemporary issues that are a threat to human existence. In the field of morality, the hegemony and pervasiveness stemming from orthodox cultural nihilism in society is a manifestation of man's desire to be free—a freedom without responsibility

(Leonard, 2018). The end result is hegemony and pervasion in matters of sex, for example, same sex sexual relationships.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The driving force behind this study emerges from the ongoing debate and ethical uncertainties about same-sex relationships in today's world. Discussions on LGBTQ over the moral and ethical validity of these relationships continue to divide public opinion and shape policies everywhere. Conventional moral viewpoints, often based on religious and cultural traditions, frequently conflict with modern perspectives advocating for equality and acceptance. This conflict necessitates a reassessment of moral standards of persons in a given society.

Nietzsche's moral philosophy offers a fascinating foundation for this reassessment. His criticism of traditional morality and urge to revalue values encourages a thorough scrutiny of deep-rooted ethical norms. Although Nietzsche's ideas have been widely studied in different ethical discussions, their specific relevance to modern debates on same-sex relationships has not been fully explored. This oversight in research is significant, considering Nietzsche's potential to provide deep insights into the essence of morality and how it applies to current social issues. To address this gap, further examination of Nietzsche's works is essential for a better understanding of morality in the context of today's challenges

1.3 The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to critically examine Nietzsche's moral beliefs and their potential impact on modern discussions regarding same-sex relationships. By exploring Nietzsche's challenge to traditional morals and his idea of revaluing values, this research intends to discover new ethical viewpoints that can contribute to the ongoing conversation on same-sex relationships

1.4 Research Objectives

The main goal of this study is to thoroughly assess how Nietzsche's moral thinking applies to today's discussions on same-sex partnerships. This main objective is divided into several more specific objectives for clarity. Specific objectives include:

- i. To critically analyse Nietzsche's moral relativism, particularly the idea of nihilism.
- ii. To analyse same-sex sexual relations as a contemporary moral issue in relation to Nietzsche's moral relativism.
- iii. To advance logical argument for the proposition of moral objectivism as a response to Nietzsche's moral relativism.

1.5 Research Questions

The study shall be guided by the following questions:

- i. What is the basis of Nietzsche's moral relativism?
- ii. Is the contemporary moral issue of same-sex sexual relations an offshoot of Nietzsche's moral relativism?
- iii. Can there be a logical argument for moral objectivism as a response to Nietzsche's moral relativism?

1.6 Significance of the Study

This study offers a substantial contribution to the ongoing discussion that spans both academic realms and broader society, particularly in relation to the ethical nuances of same-sex relationships. It embarks on a thorough and critical examination of the interplay between Nietzsche's theory of moral relativism and this modern societal issue. By exploring the junctions where Nietzsche's philosophical ideas intersect with the present-day debates surrounding same-sex relationships, this study provides invaluable insights that illuminate contemporary moral questions. Through this meticulous and analytical approach, the research not only enhances our comprehension of these multifaceted issues but also serves to elevate the overall discourse on the topic.

Consequently, this study brings the conversation to a more enlightened and well-informed level, enabling readers to engage with the complexities of same-sex relationships from a philosophically enriched perspective. As a result, it fosters a deeper understanding among scholars and the general public alike, promoting a more nuanced and sophisticated dialogue in both academic and societal discussions.

Through this precise and thorough method, the study not only deepens our understanding of these complex topics but also raises the overall level of discourse on the subject. Consequently, this paper elevates the discussion to a more enlightened and informed standard, empowering readers to approach the intricacies of same-sex relationships with a philosophically richer viewpoint. As a result, it encourages a more profound comprehension among both scholars and the general populace, fostering a more nuanced and sophisticated conversation in academic settings and society at large.

1.7 Scope of the Study

This study's scope involves a deep dive into Nietzsche's moral philosophy, focusing especially on current ethical discussions about same-sex relationships. It carefully examines Nietzsche's critique of traditional morality and his idea of reevaluating values. The study uses textual analysis of Nietzsche's works and applies his philosophical concepts to today's ethical questions.

Moreover, the study takes on an interdisciplinary approach, combining insights from legal studies, social sciences, and cultural analysis. This approach allows a well-rounded understanding of the factors shaping same-sex relationships, leading to a more nuanced ethical framework. To ground the theoretical insights, it reviews and incorporates empirical data, ensuring the study is both relevant and practically applicable.

By linking historical philosophical views with modern issues, the study seeks to challenge standard ethical frameworks and propose new perspectives advocating for equality, inclusivity, and diversity while maintaining moral objectivism as the measuring tool for morality.

Ultimately, this scope outlines a comprehensive exploration that promises meaningful contributions to both academic scholarship and practical ethical discussions. It is particularly relevant to areas such as policymaking and legal reform, aiming to influence these domains positively.

1.8 Limitation and Delimitations of the Study

This research not only provides a comprehensive and detailed analysis but also takes into account certain limitations. The inherently subjective nature of philosophical inquiry implies that interpretations may vary significantly among different readers and scholars, and Nietzsche's intricate and often enigmatic writings can indeed lead to a range of differing conclusions. Furthermore, while the investigation into same-sex relationships is both significant and relevant, it represents only a single facet within the broader spectrum of modern moral questions influenced by Nietzsche's philosophy.

Future research endeavours might consider broadening their purview to encompass additional areas. These areas could include emerging fields such as bioethics, environmental ethics, or other contemporary ethical concerns that are increasingly coming to the forefront of philosophical discourse. By meticulously planning the research methodology and adhering strictly to the highest ethical standards, this study aims to deepen scholarly comprehension of Nietzsche's concept of moral relativism and its far-reaching implications for contemporary ethical discussions.

Ultimately, the overarching goal of this research is to provide a meaningful contribution to ongoing philosophical debates in the present day. By expanding the focus beyond same-sex relationships to include a wider range of ethical issues, future studies can offer a more holistic understanding of Nietzsche's impact on modern morality. Such an approach would not only enrich the academic discourse but also enhance the practical application of Nietzschean philosophy in addressing the complex ethical dilemmas of today's world.

1.9 Assumptions of the Study

1. Nietzsche's moral philosophy continues to be highly relevant to modern ethical discussions surrounding same-sex relationships.
2. His critique of conventional morality and the revaluation of values offer significant insights for addressing contemporary issues.
3. By employing an interdisciplinary approach that incorporates legal studies, social sciences, and cultural analysis, the research endeavours to gain a comprehensive understanding of same-sex relationships.
4. Empirical data serves to ground theoretical concepts in real-world contexts, thereby increasing the study's pertinence and practical applicability.
5. Nietzsche's philosophical perspectives can bridge the gap between historical and current ethical debates, challenging established norms and advocating for fresh viewpoints.
6. The findings of the study are anticipated to be crucial for both academic research and practical ethical discussions, with the potential to influence policy-making and legislative reforms.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Nietzsche's Concept of Moral Relativism

Nietzsche portrays himself as a moral relativist. Gilbert Harman defines moral relativism as an approach in which moral good and bad, right and wrong, are always dependent on the moral framework selected (Herman & Thomson, 1996). Nietzsche seems to argue that the basis of moral relativism is the outward societal that create these values and institutions. The masters, for instance, create the good through self-affirmation, while the slaves do this by resentment. Nietzsche seems to content that morality is relative and that ethics in society is not based on truth any more than on man's invention of this behaviour and codes of conduct. Moral judgements will too, find meaning depending on the class of the utterer: master or slave. Herman & Thomson, however, seem to oversimplify Nietzsche's intricate philosophy. Their view could mix Nietzsche's denial of absolute morals with fully accepting moral relativism. Indeed, Nietzsche's stance is more subtle. While he does reject universal moral truths, he doesn't fully endorse relativism. He sees certain values as better for promoting human excellence and growth, particularly for those he calls "higher human beings." Nietzsche's critique of standard morality isn't a call for unrestricted relativism but a criticism of societal norms that hinder individual greatness. Reducing it to relativism might overlook Nietzsche's aim: rethinking values to move beyond nihilism and improve life. Further discussion on Nietzsche's perspective might uncover more layers to his philosophical intent.

The Nietzschean view is radically opposed to Immanuel Kant. Kant talks of the categorical imperative as a principle for morality for all. For Kant, categorical imperative means acting only in accordance with that maxim which you can at the same time will that it becomes the universal law (Kant, 2007). Since everyone seeks good for himself then goodness should be universal so that each attains that goodness. According to Nietzsche, there is no moral framework that is objectively privileged as the one true morality. Nietzsche, however as a person, negatively criticizes the slave and master morality in support of the 'overman' and his morality. His transvaluation of values is one

clear way of employing relativism in ethics. This transvaluation of values meant rethinking of the whole philosophical and religious tradition that produced those values.

2.1.1 Critique of Traditional Values

Nietzsche's writings often call into question the traditional ethics established by religion and society. He believed these norms are created not solely for the sake of moral guidance but to maintain hierarchies and control over individuals. This critical perspective is abundantly reflected in Nietzsche's works published in 1967. Nietzsche's view on moral relativism suggests that absolute moral truths do not exist; instead, he proposed that ethics evolve and adapt based on individual and cultural viewpoints. Scholars like Benn and Peters further supported this notion in 1959, emphasizing that morality is not a fixed or universal concept, but rather one that is fluid and subjective.

This framework fundamentally challenges the conventional concept of universal morals, opening the door for a broader understanding of diverse cultural codes. By applying this perspective, one can better grasp the varied moral landscapes, including those concerning same-sex relationships and other historically contentious issues. This notion invites a more inclusive outlook, encouraging individuals to recognize and accept the validity of different moral frameworks across various societies. Nietzsche's persistent questioning of established norms serves as a critique of the rigid standards imposed by religious and societal institutions. Rather than adhering to inflexible doctrines, he advocated for a more flexible and open-minded approach to ethics and morality. This critique urges us to reconsider and potentially liberate our understanding of ethical principles, promoting an appreciation for a diverse range of moral experiences and practices. However, this study offers a critique of Nietzsche's genealogical approach, used to challenge traditional moral values by tracing their past origins. The method can be too simplistic, ignoring the rich and complex nature of moral phenomena by explaining them merely through will to power and resentment. Moreover, his criticism of Christianity and its supported moral framework misses the beneficial impacts these values might have on social unity and human well-being. By focusing on a master-slave contrast in the evolution of moral

systems, Nietzsche endorses a sort of elitism that weakens the equalitarian ideals fundamental to today's ethical thinking.

Nietzsche's exploration of human morality outside of the Christian framework reached a peak with his deep dive into the roots of moral concepts. What sparked this investigation? Leiter believes that Nietzsche wanted to offer a comprehensive critique of moral values, to scrutinize these values, and to introduce new ideals through the concept of the "superman" (Higgins, 1997). Nietzsche argued that moral facts cannot be proven; moral judgments are illusions and unwanted. Richard Norman points out that since Nietzsche rejected the existence of moral facts, our philosophical stance on morality must undergo significant changes. Each person should explain morality in their own way (Norman, 1998).

It's evident that Nietzsche's critique of moral judgments is rooted in his belief that they lack a factual basis. In today's world, similar perspectives exist regarding moral judgments. Philosophers holding this viewpoint often argue that such judgments cannot be verified. For example, the judgment "killing one's neighbour is bad" lacks verification. We reject this reasoning as it's based on a very narrow idea of verification, which surely implies more than sensory perception like seeing, hearing, or touching.

Moral judgments, according to Nietzsche, are not only illusions but also undesirable. They are undesirable because, in his view, those who feel immoral have no justified reason for such feelings. These judgments are tied to external sources of obligation. Combined with Nietzsche's famous declaration that "God is dead," moral judgments become impossible. Nietzsche refers specifically to moral judgments within the context of Christian morality. With the end of the promise of heavenly rewards for moral actions, these judgments become both illusory and impossible.

How then do we come to these moral judgments if they are mere illusions? Without a standard to guide them, moral judgments are subjective and crafted by individuals. Nietzsche posited that moral values are created rather than discovered. Brian Leiter

suggests that Nietzsche's belief that moral values do not facilitate human excellence invites a re-evaluation of these values (Leiter, 2004). It is through moral values that one can formulate moral judgments. Nietzsche argued that as long as moral values are questioned, moral judgments are impossible. However, Leiter's support of Nietzsche's view can sometimes make moral issues appear simpler than they are by overemphasizing certain origins, which might reduce morality to mere psychological responses. Leiter ignores the beneficial aspects of traditional moral values, such as fostering social unity and selflessness, areas that Nietzsche's critique tends to downplay. Additionally, Leiter's interpretation might encourage a form of elitism, neglecting the balance between personal moral freedom and societal ethical responsibilities. This could lead to a conflict between individual excellence and the common good, raising questions about social welfare.

2.1.2 Master-Slave Morality

Nietzsche introduced the concept of master-slave morality to provide a comprehensive explanation for the origins of moral beliefs. Within this sophisticated framework, master morality is associated with the ruling class and places a high value on power, strength, and honour. Those who adhere to master morality often view themselves as creators of values and hold characteristics like pride and ambition in high esteem. On the other hand, slave morality emerges from the oppressed classes and emphasizes the importance of compassion, humility, and gentleness. Individuals who adopt slave morality value traits such as empathy, kindness, and egalitarianism since these traits serve as mechanisms for survival and cohesion among the oppressed (Nietzsche, 1967). This study critiques this framework of Nietzsche's concept of master morality which emphasizes traits like power, nobility, and independence, which can be interpreted as endorsing a form of elitism that dismisses the majority's ethical experiences and values. This model oversimplifies moral complexities and risks justifying authoritarian or oppressive behaviours by glorifying the strong and dismissing the compassionate virtues found in slave morality, such as sympathy, kindness, and humility. Furthermore, Nietzsche's historical analysis is seen as speculative and lacking empirical rigor, making it difficult to substantiate his claims about the origins and development of these moral systems. This critique underscores

concerns that while Nietzsche aims to incite a re-evaluation of values, his binary categorization might neglect the nuanced and interwoven nature of moral evolution.

The clear division between master and slave morality highlights that moral values are not absolute; rather, they are relative constructs significantly influenced and shaped by prevailing social and political circumstances. The inherent flexibility of these values suggests that they can shift and adapt over time, responding to changes in societal norms and power structures. This fluidity opens up possibilities for the acceptance and understanding of a variety of moral viewpoints, including those that pertain to same-sex relationships.

Nietzsche observed that moral judgments had been twisted throughout history and were seen differently by masters and slaves. He suggested moral nihilism as a remedy. What is considered moral for the slave is amoral for the master. He encouraged philosophers to see through the illusion of moral judgments. For Nietzsche, nihilism was a natural progression from his view on moral relativism.

In Nietzsche's view, society had metaphorically 'killed God,' leading to nihilism. This nihilism represented a crisis, characterized by a loss of meaning in life and a sense of hopelessness, a sentiment fostered by Christianity. This necessitated a rethinking and rebuilding of values, paving the way for the idea of the 'superman.' In "The Gay Science" (1882), Nietzsche touched on these themes. However, this study views Nietzsche's Gay Science as being fragmented and disjointed articulation of ideas, which can challenge readers seeking a cohesive argument. This stylistic choice, while reflective of Nietzsche's intent to disrupt conventional structures of thought, risks alienating those unfamiliar with his philosophical approach. Furthermore, Nietzsche's proclamation of the "death of God" and his critique of traditional morality, while ground-breaking, may strike some as overly nihilistic and despairing. His emphasis on the creation of personal meaning and values in a godless world presents a daunting task, potentially leading to a sense of existential dread rather than empowerment. This aspect underscores the difficulty in reconciling

Nietzsche's visionary concepts with practical, everyday human experiences and ethical frameworks.

Huddleston, in his book "Nietzsche on Nihilism: A Unifying Thread," argues that nihilism was a central concern for Nietzsche. Scholars in the English-speaking world generally agree with this interpretation. However, challenges arise from the diverse characters Nietzsche labels as nihilistic. For Nietzsche, nihilism affects those who, after the 'death of God,' lose their sense of meaning and fall into despair, as well as Christianity itself, which he views as promoting meaninglessness. Another form of nihilism is seeing a world guided by God, yet equally pointless. Huddleston's careful analysis and in-depth look at nihilism are praiseworthy. However, his narrow focus might cover up the wider and more subtle parts of Nietzsche's philosophy. His method can feel too limiting at times, possibly ignoring how nihilism interacts with other important themes in Nietzsche's ideas, such as the will-to-power and the change of values. Also, his work sounds difficult and deeply theoretical, making it hard for those not familiar with Nietzsche's work to fully grasp.

Guiyan, in the article "Nietzsche's Nihilism," suggests that Nietzsche saw nihilism rooted in European traditional metaphysics and Christian morality, especially regarding values. Noticing the widespread nihilism in his society, Nietzsche sought urgent solutions. Unfortunately, his extreme proposals, like re-evaluating all values, may not have fully resolved the nihilism problem. Guiyan skilfully handles the subtleties of nihilism. However, the work sometimes misses out on placing this within the larger scope of Nietzsche's philosophy. Concepts like the *Übermensch* and eternal recurrence aren't explored as deeply. This narrow focus might restrict the book's reach and attractiveness to a broader audience.

Claude Geffré and Jean-Pierre Jossua, in their book "Nietzsche and Christianity" (1968), argue that today's interest in the crisis of meaning doesn't mostly lead to Nietzsche. Nor does studying Nietzsche direct one towards neo-nihilism. Current nihilism is found in scientific knowledge, ascetic ideals, and middle-class life concepts. However, Nietzsche

undeniably influenced structuralist movements that often veered towards neo-nihilism. Claude and Jossua explore Friedrich Nietzsche's criticism of Christianity with a thoughtful and reflective approach. Their work combines philosophical questions with theological insights, navigating between Nietzsche's reproaches and Christian beliefs. The authors aim to provoke contemplation on the deeper existential and moral aspects of Nietzsche's arguments. However, despite a detailed examination of Nietzsche's critiques, the text occasionally falls short in connecting these ideas to modern Christian views or practical applications. This could leave readers wanting more on how these two seemingly opposing perspectives might be reconciled in today's world.

2.1.3 Will-to-Power

Nietzsche's concept of the will-to-power is central to his philosophical framework, highlighting the intrinsic drive within all living beings to assert and expand their influence and control (Nietzsche, 1968). This idea extends beyond the simple drive for survival, embodying a profound yearning for growth, dominance, and relentless innovation.

The will-to-power ultimately creates the superman. For Nietzsche, the concept of Superman is a unique superhuman who transcends ordinary people, someone with original values and exceptional self-worth. This individual embodies the utmost potential of power and greatness, as described by Berg (1916). Genius in Superman represents the peak of will to power and the highest conceivable evolution on Earth.

The Superman experiences life in a profound way, encountering thoughts and visions that seem to originate from an outside force, coming from above or below like lightning strikes. Berg notes this in 1916, describing Superman as a man who is perhaps a storm filled with new lightning, heralded by strange happenings around him. This extraordinary figure often fears himself, yet his deep curiosity can lead him to understand himself, as suggested by Hoslett in 1939. Indeed, Superman stands beyond all human achievements, past, present, and future, shining in intellect, morality, and physical prowess. He represents the pinnacle of evolution, the salt and sensibility of the Earth. According to

Warbeke in 1909, humankind exists to live and die for him, the distinguished aristocrat who shapes the fate of society.

Superman is a more fully developed man, noble and aristocratic. His strength is not just physical but also intellectual, possessing independence of spirit, artistic sensitivity, and psychological understanding. For Nietzsche, the Superman symbolizes truth, independence, nobility, and unwavering courage. He has mastery over himself, unmoved by passion or lust. This being epitomizes life at its most vibrant. To Nietzsche, this life equates to the will to power.

Such a figure carries not only physical vigour but also profound intellectual prowess and a deep, soulful independence. Through appreciation of art and keen psychological insight, Superman demonstrates truthfulness, nobility, and immense courage. He exemplifies a life pulsing with vitality, proving Nietzsche's idea that the real noble person fully embodies the force of life.

From this viewpoint, Nietzsche's notion offers a compelling explanation for the dynamic and fluid nature of moral values, demonstrating their responsiveness to evolving cultural and social contexts. Through this lens, one can understand the continuous transformation and adaptation of moral principles as society's progress and change.

In examining Nietzsche's concept of the will to power, Berg provides a detailed and insightful analysis that highlights the intricate aspects of the philosopher's ideas on human ambition and drive. Berg tackles the philosophical foundations and meanings of this concept, revealing how Nietzsche saw it as the core force driving human actions, creativity, and social systems. Although Berg adeptly places Nietzsche's ideas within the wider context of his body of work and historical setting, there is sometimes a lack of discussion on critical counterarguments that could have enriched the debate.

Nietzsche himself, using Zarathustra as his voice, Nietzsche delves into crucial ideas like the superman, eternal recurrence, and critiques of standard morality and religion. He encourages readers to rise above the usual crowd-thought. Even with its deep philosophical and literary excellence, the book is often dense, with stylized prose, making it difficult and alienating for those not familiar with Nietzsche's ideas. Furthermore, Zarathustra's symbolic teachings require careful, multiple readings to fully understand, which might pose a barrier to a wider readership.

Hoslett's book on *Nietzsche's Superman*, as seen above, offers a detailed look into the concept of the Übermensch. He links Nietzsche's philosophical thoughts to their wider ethical and societal consequences. Hoslett skilfully examines Nietzsche's criticism of traditional morality and Christianity, emphasizing the potential of the Superman to introduce new values. Yet, one could argue that Hoslett sometimes makes Nietzsche's ideas too complex, possibly alienating a broader readership. Furthermore, while Hoslett's intellectual depth is praiseworthy, the book lacks tangible applications or modern-day relevance, especially as ethical standards continue to evolve.

On his part, Warbeke skilfully breaks down Nietzsche's thoughts, showing "will to power" not as pure dominance but as a fundamental force present in all aspects of life and human actions. The book nicely connects Nietzsche's abstract ideas with real-world examples, making the philosophy feel relatable. Yet, a criticism of Warbeke's work is the frequent use of complicated and technical terminology, which might turn away readers who aren't familiar with philosophical language. Additionally, although Warbeke offers valuable interpretations, the text could be improved by engaging more deeply with differing perspectives to offer a more balanced discussion.

2.2 Contemporary Moral Issues: Same-Sex Sexual Relationships

The moral perception of same-sex sexual relationships has shifted significantly, mirroring broader societal moves towards more acceptance of LGBTQ rights. Historically, same-sex relationships faced heavy stigma, were illegal, and were seen as mental disorders due to deeply rooted religious, cultural, and traditional beliefs (Fone, 2001). However,

modern ethical frameworks now stress principles of equality, human rights, and personal freedom, challenging these old views (Sullivan, 1996).

This change is in line with theoretical viewpoints that promote a relative approach to morality, suggesting that ethical judgments depend on specific cultural and historical situations. These perspectives, echoing Nietzsche's critique of universal moral standards, endorse an ethical view that respects and legitimizes same-sex relationships as equal to heterosexual ones (Wong, 2006). Consequently, contemporary talks on same-sex relationships illustrate a significant and ongoing move towards a more fair and context-sensitive understanding of sexual ethics.

2.2.1 Historical Context

Throughout history and across different cultures, the acceptance of same-sex sexual relations by society has undergone notable changes. In numerous communities, same-sex relationships have faced considerable stigma, have been punishable by criminal charges, and were often classified as mental disorders. This negative perception was primarily influenced by prevalent religious or cultural beliefs (Fone, 2001).

Nevertheless, in contrast to these longstanding views, recent developments, particularly in Western countries, have led to a more widespread acceptance and legal acknowledgment of same-sex partnerships. These changes illustrate the dynamic nature of societal norms and underscore the expanding movement towards equality and inclusivity for the LGBTQ+ community. Whereas the above authors are pro-same-sex relations, this study articulates the necessity of moral objectivism of the molarity of a society like Kenya.

2.2.2 Modern Ethical Perspectives

Contemporary views on same-sex relationships have increasingly centred on themes of equality, individual rights, and personal freedom. Modern liberal thought proposes that same-sex relationships, much like their heterosexual counterparts, deserve equal moral and legal respect, as articulated by Sullivan in 1996. This approach urges a re-evaluation

of long-standing moral beliefs, aligning with Nietzsche's critique of static moral principles. Such inclusivity is indicative of society's progress and a broader commitment to ensuring fair treatment and respect for all individuals, regardless of their sexual orientation. It underscores how modern perspectives are evolving to embrace a more equitable and just social framework, reflecting a societal shift towards greater inclusivity and fairness.

This evolving mind-set not only challenges traditional norms but also champions the recognition and validation of diverse identities, thereby fostering an environment where all individuals can thrive without fear of discrimination. In essence, the contemporary discourse on same-sex relationships is a testament to humanity's ongoing pursuit of justice, equality, and respect for the inherent dignity of every person.

2.3 Intersection of Nietzsche's Moral Relativism and Same-Sex Relationships

The merging of Nietzsche's moral relativism and same-sex relationships offers a fascinating perspective on modern moral dilemmas. It brings attention to how flexible and influenced by culture moral values can be. Nietzsche questions traditional and religious moral systems, which often maintain strict and opposing views toward same-sex relationships. This highlights the need for personal value creation free from societal pressures (Nietzsche, 1966-1967).

His concept of master-slave morality also clarifies that dominant moral beliefs support power structures that push non-heteronormative identities to the margins. This implies that moral opinions on same-sex relationships aren't based on universal truths but are shaped by current social and political climates (Benn & Peters, 1959; Hatab, 2000).

Following Nietzsche's relativism, a more accepting and flexible ethical approach is promoted. This approach acknowledges the ethical validity of various sexual orientations by cherishing individual freedom and cultural variety (Wong, 2006). Therefore, bringing Nietzschean relativism into discussions about same-sex relationships leads to re-

evaluating established moral standards and fosters a fairer and more context-aware ethical dialogue.

2.3.1 Relativistic Moral Frameworks

Nietzsche's perspective on moral relativism provides a thought-provoking and deeply profound framework for examining and understanding the moral acceptance of same-sex relationships. His rejection of universal moral principles, which are considered to apply uniformly to all individuals, allows for a more inclusive embrace of diverse moral viewpoints. Nietzsche's philosophy highlights the significant role that various factors—such as cultural contexts, historical settings, and individual personal experiences—play in shaping values and moral judgments (Wong, 2006).

By adopting this comprehensive and nuanced approach, we are encouraged to consider that the moral evaluation of same-sex relationships should not be treated as an isolated issue. Instead, it should be contextualized within the specific cultural and historical environments in which these relationships exist. Such an approach reinforces the idea that one cannot make sweeping moral judgments without acknowledging the diverse and particular circumstances that influence individuals' perceptions and experiences of morality.

2.3.2 Critique of Religious and Traditional Moral Values

Nietzsche's harsh critique of religious and traditional moral values remains profoundly pertinent in discussions today, particularly those centred on same-sex relationships. Numerous moral objections to same-sex relationships are entrenched in religious beliefs and longstanding traditional views. Nietzsche regarded these as artificially constructed systems, purposefully designed to manipulate and subjugate individuals (Nietzsche, 1966).

By questioning and dismantling these entrenched norms, Nietzsche's philosophy supports a re-evaluation of the frequently encountered moral condemnation of same-sex relationships. Instead, it promotes their acceptance and acknowledgment. This

philosophical stance not only advocates for a reconsideration of prevalent moral judgments but also fosters a wider, more inclusive perspective on ethical evaluations as a whole. By doing so, it offers a critical lens through which we can examine and potentially transform our moral landscape to be more accepting and inclusive. However, though his critique piercingly questions the foundations of Christian ethics and the genuineness of moral norms, it might sometimes seem too dismissive, not fully acknowledging how selfless values can benefit society and promote progress.

2.3.3 The Will-to-Power and Sexual Autonomy

The idea of the will to power can be closely related to the ongoing discussion of sexual independence and the ethical acceptance and approval of same-sex relationships. The will to power, as a philosophical concept, emphasizes the importance of self-assertion and the creation of personal values, as articulated by Nietzsche (1968). This powerful concept resonates deeply with the modern emphasis on individual freedom and the inherent right of individuals to establish their own moral and sexual beliefs, free from the constraints and norms imposed by society. Seen in this light, the acceptance and embracement of same-sex relationships can be interpreted as a significant display of personal freedom and a strong refusal to comply with restrictive moral codes that society attempts to enforce (Richardson, 2000).

By firmly insisting on their right to love whom they choose, individuals not only assert their own power but also actively create personal values that are closely aligned with their identity and beliefs. Consequently, the idea of the will to power does not merely support but also vigorously celebrates the ethical approval of same-sex relationships as a profound expression of genuine personal liberty and autonomy.

2.4 Criticisms and Counterarguments

Critics of Nietzsche's moral relativism often highlight the danger of ethical nihilism and unpredictable morals. They worry about a lack of universal moral standards for guiding human actions and maintaining social harmony (Reginster 2006). Some argue that if all morals are viewed as arbitrary and personal, it could lead to a chaotic moral landscape

where harmful acts might be excused as personal choices (Janaway 2007). Additionally, others fear that Nietzsche's rejection of traditional moral frameworks may hinder efforts to address widespread injustices, potentially reinforcing power disparities and marginalization (Hatab 2005).

On the other hand, supporters of Nietzschean relativism insist that his philosophy does not mean abandoning moral responsibility. Instead, it promotes a critical look at enforced values and the development of genuine, life-affirming principles that align with both individual and community well-being (Clark & Dudrick 2012). By focusing on crafting personal values, Nietzsche advocates for a more adaptable ethical stance—one that can adjust to different cultural settings and encourage true moral advancement without falling into authoritarian moral rules (Ridley 1998).

2.4.1 Criticisms of Moral Relativism

Critics of moral relativism argue that it weakens the foundation of objective moral principles, which they see as crucial for maintaining a cohesive and effective society. They contend that in the absence of these universal standards, ethical decisions become entirely subjective, leading to chaos and disputes that are difficult to resolve (MacIntyre, 1984). These critics also emphasize that, concerning same-sex relationships, moral relativism could, in some cases, legitimize damaging behaviours by appealing to cultural or personal variances. Furthermore, they worry that this relativistic perspective might result in an erosion of agreement on fundamental societal values. Thus, they argue that society needs a set of objective moral principles to function smoothly and resolve conflicts effectively.

2.4.2 Nietzschean Response

Nietzsche's thought addresses these critiques by emphasizing the essential role of dialogue and mutual respect for various moral viewpoints. He argued that recognizing the changeable nature of moral values does not negate the possibility of united action or ethical consistency. In fact, it paves the way for a more inclusive moral structure capable of addressing modern ethical dilemmas, including those related to same-sex relationships.

Nietzsche believed that by acknowledging the fluidity and context-dependent nature of moral values, a society is better equipped to work together harmoniously, even when its members hold a diverse array of ethical beliefs.

This more adaptable approach is highlighted by scholars such as Wong (2006), who affirm that such flexibility allows for a dynamic and inclusive ethical framework, making it well-suited to tackle contemporary social issues. In this way, Nietzsche's philosophical perspective encourages embracing the diversity of moral outlooks to foster unity and cooperation within a pluralistic society. Furthermore, this inclusive moral framework, rooted in flexibility, not only accommodates but also celebrates the uniqueness of individual perspectives, thus contributing to a more cohesive and harmonious collective ethos.

In a nutshell, this review delves deeply into the intersection of Nietzsche's ideas on moral relativism and the modern issue of same-sex relationships. Nietzsche's critical examination of established societal values, his concept of master-slave morality, and his emphasis on the will to power provide an insightful lens through which one can understand the moral acceptance of same-sex relationships. By promoting a flexible and inclusive moral framework, Nietzsche's philosophy challenges traditional values and advocates for the acknowledgment of diverse moral viewpoints. Therefore, delving into how Nietzsche's ideas can be applied to contemporary ethical dilemmas, particularly debates surrounding same-sex relationships, is essential. Such exploration promotes broader acceptance and a deeper understanding of these issues. Future studies will be instrumental in continuing and expanding this crucial discourse.

2.5 Theoretical Framework

This study is firmly anchored in Friedrich Nietzsche's profound concept of moral relativism. It argues vigorously against the existence of universal moral truths, proposing instead that moral values are inherently contingent upon individual or cultural perspectives. At the heart of this discussion are Nietzsche's compelling concepts of the will to power and the revaluation of all values. These philosophical notions are critical

and serve as the fundamental groundwork for investigating how Nietzsche's ideas remain relevant to contemporary moral debates, particularly those surrounding same-sex relationships. In a detailed and extensive exploration, this study delves deeply not only into the philosophical foundations but also into the real-world implications of such debates.

The overarching goal of this study is to provide a nuanced and comprehensive exploration of the intersections between Nietzschean philosophy and modern ethical issues. It aims to accurately situate Nietzsche's thoughts within contemporary discourses, thereby providing a clearer understanding of his philosophical stance. By meticulously scrutinizing the philosophical underpinnings and their practical applications, this study endeavours to shed significant light on the contemporary pertinence of Nietzsche's ideas, especially in relation to the moral considerations and ongoing discussions pertinent to same-sex relationships in today's society.

Through this rigorous analysis, the research seeks to offer in-depth and comprehensive insights into how Nietzsche's philosophy can inform and significantly contribute to current ethical debates. In particular, it focuses on the moral discourse surrounding same-sex relationships, thus highlighting the timeless and contemporary relevance of Nietzsche's thought. This study aims to showcase not only the theoretical aspects but also the practical ramifications of Nietzsche's philosophy in understanding and addressing modern-day ethical issues.

Specifically, the study employs ethical relativism to provide a necessary context within which to understand the connection between Nietzsche's views on moral relativism and contemporary attitudes toward same-sex relationships. This approach helps unpack the complexities involved in making moral judgments under different cultural and personal circumstances (Gunningham, 2019; Wong, 2020). Here is how ethical relativism is framed within this area of inquiry:

Cultural background and moral standards: Ethical relativism asserts that ethical values are not uniform across all cultures but rather differ significantly from one culture to another (Rachels, 2003). This perspective allows for a critical examination of the sceptical stance on morality in contemporary debates regarding same-sex relationships. Acknowledging and studying the diversity of moral codes in society enables us to explore how Nietzsche's rejection of fixed morality corresponds with the acceptance of same-sex relationships in various cultural environments (Rogers, 2021).

Nietzsche's opposition to conventional morality: Nietzsche's philosophy frequently criticizes the enforcement of universal moral principles, especially when they are based on religious or metaphysical elements. This critique aligns with ethical relativism, suggesting that moral views concerning sexual relationships evolve according to historical and societal contexts (Reginster, 2006; Swindal, 2012). This raises the question of how social definitions of morality may adapt to or resist changes in attitudes toward same-sex relationships.

Personal moral philosophy: Relativism posits that judgments of value are arbitrary and subjective, supporting Nietzsche's view that morality reflects the mores of particular societies (Gunningham, 2019; Wong, 2020). This level of analysis is crucial for understanding how people in same-sex relationships navigate moral systems that can be either supportive or hostile, emphasizing how personal and communal experiences shape one's moral philosophies (Taylor, 2021).

Pertinence to present-day moral conversations: The application of ethical relativism facilitates engaged discussions about contemporary moral matters, including same-sex relationships. This study examines whether Nietzsche's ideas on moral flexibility and the rejection of fixed standards can elucidate present discourses on sexual ethics. It raises the question of how the recognition and rights of individuals in same-sex unions can be reconciled with varying moral environments (Rogers, 2021).

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Location of the Study

Research was carried out at the Chuka University Library, located in Kenya. Chuka University is in Chuka Town, part of the Meru South Sub County in Tharaka-Nithi County. It sits about 186 kilometres north of Nairobi, on the eastern slopes of Mount Kenya. For more precision, Chuka University is located at roughly 0.319662 degrees latitude and 37.655553 degrees longitude. This setting provides a peaceful and supportive environment for academic studies and research efforts.

The Chuka University Library has relevant resources and references for the academic research. It offers a wide array of information resources available to students, faculty, and researchers. The library boasts a rich collection of books, academic journals, digital resources, and other crucial research materials.

Several benefits came with conducting research at the Chuka University Library:

- 1. Diverse Resources:** The library's extensive collection covered many fields, allowing for thorough studies and access to important academic materials.
- 2. Modern Facilities:** Equipped with up-to-date technology, such as computers and internet access, the library offered the essential tools needed for current research and data work.
- 3. Academic Setting:** Chuka University's calm environment was ideal for focused and uninterrupted research. The library frequently welcomed scholars and researchers, creating a fostering academic setting.
- 4. Institutional Assistance:** Being part of Chuka University, the library provided support services like research consultations, interlibrary loans, and access to the university's databases and academic subscriptions.

For research purposes, the Chuka University Library proved to be an excellent choice. It combined a wealth of resources, modern facilities, and a supportive academic environment, which were key elements for achieving high-quality research outcomes.

3.2 Research Design

This research employed a qualitative approach that is firmly grounded in both text analysis and philosophical exploration. By meticulously analysing the key writings of Nietzsche, along with those of other major philosophers, and by thoroughly reviewing a wide range of academic interpretations, the study aims to provide a comprehensive and in-depth understanding of the concepts of moral relativism and objectivism. This methodological framework of the study enables a thorough examination of complex theoretical ideas, shedding significant light on their impact and relevance in contemporary moral debates and ethical dilemmas.

Through detailed scrutiny and interpretative techniques, the research not only investigates but profoundly delves into the nuanced philosophical arguments and their historical context. This, in turn, ultimately facilitates a broader and more profound comprehension of these vital ethical concepts and their wide-ranging implications in today's society. By expanding our understanding in such a holistic manner, the research endeavours to contribute meaningfully to the current discussions surrounding ethics and morality, offering insights that are both academically rigorous and contextually relevant to modern-day moral issues.

3.3 Data Collection

The data for this thesis is acquired through a meticulous and carefully designed two-step process. In the first phase, primary sources are meticulously gathered. These sources include significant and influential works by Friedrich Nietzsche, such as *Beyond Good and Evil*, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, and *On the Genealogy of Morality*. These texts form the foundation of the research and provide crucial insights into Nietzsche's original thoughts and philosophies.

Following this, the second phase involves an in-depth examination of secondary sources. This includes a diverse range of scholarly articles, academic books, and contemporary analyses that delve into Nietzsche's views on moral philosophy. These secondary sources are scrutinized with a keen focus on their relevance to current and modern ethical discussions, especially those concerning the issue of same-sex relationships. By employing this comprehensive and thorough method, the thesis aims to offer a nuanced and in-depth understanding of Nietzsche's significant philosophical contributions and their meaningful implications for contemporary moral dilemmas.

3.4 Data Analysis

Reviewing gathered texts involves a meticulous and detailed study of Nietzsche's arguments alongside their various scholarly interpretations. This comprehensive examination requires an in-depth engagement with both Nietzsche's original writings and the extensive body of critical analysis that has been developed around his ideas. Employing various methods such as content analysis and thematic coding allows researchers to differentiate and classify recurring themes and patterns that emerge within these texts.

These methodological tools enable a thorough investigation, identifying key concepts and recurrent motifs that are crucial for an in-depth understanding. These insights are instrumental in analysing and comparing the concepts of moral relativism and moral objectivism. Special emphasis is placed on the relevance and application of these philosophical principles to contemporary moral issues, ensuring that the study remains pertinent and practically valuable. By systematically contrasting moral relativism with moral objectivism, this study highlights the distinctive application and implication in today's ethical discussions.

This systematic approach offers a richer and deeper understanding of these doctrines within the context of current societal debates, shedding light on how these ethical theories translate into real-world scenarios. This comprehensive approach provides valuable perspectives on the different ways these moral philosophies can be interpreted and

applied. By doing so, it not only broadens our knowledge but also enriches our grasp of their significance in modern ethical frameworks. Through this detailed and methodical analysis, the study illuminates the diverse implications and potential applications of moral relativism and moral objectivism, thereby contributing significantly to ongoing conversations in contemporary moral philosophy.

3.5 Method of Analysis

This research adopts an inclusive approach, combining various disciplines to meet its aims. The methodology we use merges both theory and practice, ensuring a thorough examination of Nietzsche's moral philosophy when applied to current discussions on same-sex relationships.

3.5.1 Textual Analysis

The study has performed a close reading of Nietzsche's main works like *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, *Beyond Good and Evil*, and *On the Genealogy of Morality*. Our goal? Extract and interpret his criticism of traditional morality and his concept of value reevaluation. Additionally, a review of secondary literature and interpretations provides context and deepen our understanding.

3.5.2 Theoretical Application

This part of the study uses Nietzsche's ideas to explore debates on same-sex relationships. The study has pinpointed themes in his philosophy and assessed their impact on modern talks about morality, equality, and inclusivity. By comparing these with other ethical systems, it underlines the unique aspects and limitations of Nietzschean ethics.

3.5.3 Interdisciplinary Integration

A holistic view of same-sex relationships and their ethical questions is achieved by incorporating insights from law, social sciences, and cultural studies. This ensures our analysis reflects the complex nature of the subject, considering legal rights, societal acceptance, and cultural norms.

3.5.4 Synthesis of Findings

Combining textual analysis, theoretical application, interdisciplinary integration, and empirical research ensures a thorough and nuanced study of Nietzsche's moral philosophy and its relevance to modern ethical issues. This holistic approach helps us form a well-rounded understanding of the topic, offering valuable insights and practical guidance for addressing the ethical challenges of today.

3.5.4 Historical and Phenomenological Philosophical Methods

Over all, the study employs a philosophical historical method, complemented by a phenomenological approach. The historical method considers the context of the history of ideas, examining how and why Nietzsche's philosophy developed within the specific social and cultural circumstances of his time (Lampert, 2004). Understanding these contexts is crucial for making sense of Nietzsche's criticisms of morality, allowing for a nuanced interpretation of his views on moral relativism (Kaupp, 2016).

Nietzsche wrote during a period when traditional moral frameworks, particularly those tied to Christianity, were beginning to wane. His rejection of fixed moral values suggests a shift towards viewing morality as relative and socially constructed (Gaut, 2015). Therefore, it is essential to acknowledge the historical conditions that contributed to this transformation.

Utilizing this method lets us discern the various influences that shaped Nietzsche's thinking, including the Enlightenment, Romanticism, and the rise of the natural sciences (Kofman, 2017). These influences informed his attitudes towards ethical issues, many of which have evolved into contemporary debates, including those related to sexuality. Consequently, an in-depth analysis of Nietzsche's major works, such as *On the Genealogy of Morals* and *Beyond Good and Evil*, is necessary to trace the development of his ideas concerning morality and ethics (Calhoun, 2020). This examination provides insights into the implications of his moral relativism, particularly in the context of social issues like the debate surrounding same-sex partnerships.

The historical method is complemented by the phenomenological method in this study. The phenomenological approach requires a detailed explication of Nietzsche's texts, such as *On the Genealogy of Morals* and *Beyond Good and Evil*, to illustrate how his ideas developed in connection to historical philosophers and ethical theories, and to understand the consequences his moral relativism would have on social issues, particularly same-sex partnerships (Richardson, 2017; Reginster, 2006).

Moreover, when employing a phenomenological method, the emphasis is on analysing the experiences of individuals and how they interpret their lives, especially concerning moral codes and sexual identity (Hein & Zaremba, 2022). By utilizing phenomenology, the researcher has investigated the subjective realities of individuals in same-sex relationships. This study aims to understand how these individuals perceive moral norms that might hinder the recognition of their relationships (Schweitzer, 2021).

The phenomenological approach emphasizes that personal and cultural contexts are preconditions for moral thought. Examining how people view morality and its relational aspects within their lives helps determine whether Nietzsche's ideas resonate with contemporary sensitivities regarding sexual orientation (Smith, 2019). This analysis instigates critical reflections on the social norms and values shaping individual identities and relationships, highlighting the urgent relevance of Nietzsche's philosophy in current debates on ethics surrounding same-sex relationships.

3.6 Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations are critical in maintaining the study's integrity and societal value. The study's analysis and conclusions aim for objectivity, avoiding bias or preconceived ideas about same-sex relationships. Nietzsche's moral philosophy and its relevance today is examined with an open mind to respect all viewpoints. Balancing arguments and insights to achieve academic rigor and cultural sensitivity is essential. This research maintains a critical ethical perspective, ensuring integrity, validity, and social impact.

The researcher sought permission from the National Council for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI). The researcher made sure ethical

considerations were met throughout the research process, including rights to copyrighted material where necessary, recognizing the contributions of others where cited and adhering to the privacy and confidentiality where required in the course of sourcing data from Libraries or educational open resources in the digital platforms.

CHAPTER FOUR

AN ANALYSIS OF NIETZSCHE'S MORAL RELATIVISM

4.1 General Understanding of Moral Relativism

According to Harman G. (1975), moral relativism is a philosophical theory that suggests that morality is not universal and that moral principles are relative to the cultural, social, or individual contexts in which they are found. Harman argues that moral judgments are based on the conventions of a particular group rather than on objective truths. Moral relativists generally assert that ethical principles do not reflect absolute and universal truths but are instead contingent upon cultural, social, or personal perspectives. Moral relativism is contrasted with moral absolutism or objectivism, which asserts that there are universal moral principles that apply to all individuals regardless of context. Therefore, moral relativism and moral objectivism represent two opposing perspectives in the field of ethics regarding the nature of moral truths.

Moral relativists present several arguments to support the view that moral principles are not universal but instead depend on cultural, social, or individual contexts. For instance, in her book, *Patterns of Culture*, Ruth Benedict highlights the differences in moral codes between societies, such as the acceptance of polygamy in some cultures versus its prohibition in others. She argues that such differences demonstrate the cultural specificity of moral values (Benedict, 1934). The uncommonly witnessed moral disagreements on special issues in ethics, such as capital punishment, euthanasia, and abortion reflect deep cultural divisions rather than objective moral facts. These disagreements indicate that moral beliefs are influenced by cultural and social contexts rather than universal truths (Harman, 1975).

Empirical studies from anthropology often reveal significant variations in moral practices and beliefs across different cultures, supporting the relativist view that morality is culturally dependent. For instance, James Rachels in *The Elements of Moral Philosophy*, cites anthropological studies showing diverse practices such as the differing views on infanticide and the treatment of the elderly. These studies support the idea that moral values are not universal but culturally determined (Rachels, 1986).

Besides, moral relativists argue that moral concepts themselves are relative. What constitutes ‘justice’ ‘virtue,’ or ‘goodness’ for instance, can vary intensely between cultures, suggesting that these concepts do not have a single, objective definition. Richard B. Brandt, in his article “Ethical Relativism” explores how different societies conceptualize moral terms differently. For instance, the concept of justice in a tribal society may differ significantly from that in a modern industrial society, indicating conceptual relativity (Brandt, 1967)

4.1.1 Moral Objectivism

Moral objectivists, assert the existence of objective moral truths that apply universally, allowing for the critique and evaluation of moral practices across different cultures. The central claim for moral objectivists is that there are fundamental moral principles that apply universally, regardless of cultural or individual differences. A proponent of this claim is a leading philosopher of the late 18th and early 19th century, Immanuel Kant who posits the Categorical Imperative (CI) – a universal moral law that applies to all rational beings (Kant, 1785). Kant introduces the categorical imperative as the foundational principle of moral law. Unlike hypothetical imperatives, which are conditional and depend on personal desires – e.g., “If you want to be healthy, you should exercise” – categorical imperatives are unconditional and apply universally to all rational beings, regardless of their particular desires or goals. Therefore, according to Kant, moral principles are objective and independent of personal feelings or cultural context. These principles are derived from reason and are binding on all rational agents. The universality of moral law is grounded in the shared rationality of human beings. (Kant, 1785)

Moral objectivism is often tied to moral realism, a position that there are objective moral facts that exist independently of human beliefs or attitudes. Moral realists hold that certain actions are right or wrong, regardless of individual or cultural opinions. For instance, the statement “killing an innocent person is wrong” is objectively true, regardless of individual or societal beliefs (Shafer-Landau, 2003). Generally, moral objectivists critique moral relativism for leading to moral scepticism and failing to

provide a solid basis for criticizing harmful practices. According to J.L. Mackie, moral relativism undermines the possibility of objective moral critique and leads to a form of moral nihilism (Mackie, 1977). Some moral objectivists also argue that cultural differences do not necessarily imply the absence of universal moral truths – as relativists hold – rather, they might reflect different applications or understandings of these truths (Shafer-Landau 2003).

4.1.2 Nietzsche’s Relativistic Morality

Friedrich Nietzsche’s views on morality can be seen as relativistic in several significant ways. His critique of traditional moral values, his distinction between master and slave morality, and his call for the creation of individual values all contribute to a relativistic understanding of morality in Nietzsche’s worldview. In the first place, Nietzsche was highly critical of traditional morality, especially Christian morality, which he saw as life-denying and based on false premises. He argued that Christian morality promoted values such as humility and meekness, which he saw as stemming from a ‘slave morality’ designed to subvert the power of the strong (Nietzsche, 1887). This morality, according to Nietzsche, was a reaction by the weak against the strong, turning virtues of strength and nobility into vices.

Nietzsche’s distinction between master and slave morality is central to his relativistic view of morality. Master morality is associated with the morality of the strong and noble people who value qualities such as strength, power, and pride. Master morality is life-affirming and self-assertive (Nietzsche, 1887). In his own words he says: “The noble type of man experiences itself as determining values; it does not need approval; it judges, ‘what is harmful to me is harmful in itself’ it knows itself to be that which first accords honour to things; it is value-creating” (Nietzsche, *“Beyond Good and Evil,”* 1966). Unlike slave morality, which arises from the resentment of the weak and oppressed, master morality is direct and affirmative. It does not rely on the negation of others but is based on self-affirmation and self-glorification. In *On the Genealogy of Morality*, he says:

In the foreground stands the feeling of plenitude, of power that seeks to overflow, the happiness of high tension, the consciousness of a wealth that would like to give away and bestow: – the noble person also helps the unfortunate, but not – or hardly ever – out of pity, but rather from an urge generated by the super-abundance of power. (Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morality*, 1994)

In contrast, slave morality is associated with the weak and oppressed, valuing qualities such as kindness, empathy, and humility. Slave morality is reactive, born out of resentment towards the powerful (Nietzsche, 1887). It is here now that Nietzsche affirms the Christian morality as a form of slave morality, which is characterized by values such as humility, meekness, and pity, in opposition to the master morality that values strength, power, and nobility. “Slave morality”, he says, “is essentially a morality of utility. Here is the seat of the origin of the famous antithesis ‘good’ and ‘evil’ – power and danger were felt to exist in evil, a certain dreadfulness, subtlety, and strength, which could not admit of being despised” (Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*, 1966).

In the master morality, the distinction is between ‘good’ and ‘bad,’ where ‘good’ refers to the qualities of the noble and powerful, while ‘bad’ refers to the qualities that are weak and contemptible. This is different from the dichotomy of ‘good’ and ‘evil’ in slave morality, where ‘evil’ is defined by what threatens the weak. However, Nietzsche's work *Beyond Good and Evil* encapsulates his relativistic approach to morality. He challenged the simplistic dichotomy of good and evil, suggesting that such distinctions are overly simplistic and fail to capture the complexity of human life and actions. Nietzsche, therefore, advocated for an individualistic approach to morality, where each person transcends conventional moral categories and lives according to their own values and principles (Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Beyond Good and Evil*, 1966)

Nietzsche’s broader philosophical concept of perspectivism also applies to his views on morality. He argued that moral values are not absolute but contingent upon various perspectives. According to Nietzsche, what one group or individual considers virtuous, another might see as vice, depending on their differing perspectives and experiences (Nietzsche, 1886). He rejects the idea of an objective, universal moral standard. Instead,

he claims that moral values are human constructs, shaped by various factors including power dynamics, cultural traditions, and individual experiences. Again, his distinction between master and slave morality exemplifies his perspectivism in morality. These two types of morality represent different perspectives based on social positions and psychological states. While master morality values strength, power, and nobility which arises from the strong and noble individuals who see themselves as the creators of values, slave morality values qualities such as kindness, empathy, and humility which emerges from the perspective of the oppressed and weak, who develop these values as a reaction against the powerful (Nietzsche, 1887).

4.1.3 Beyond Moral Relativism

Although Nietzsche's philosophy has elements that align with moral relativism, it also transcends it in significant ways. For instance, while he criticizes the traditional moral systems and values, arguing that they are not universally valid but are instead contingent upon historical, cultural, and psychological factors, he also goes further by proposing a radical re-evaluation of all values. He doesn't simply accept existing moral diversity but actively calls for the creation of new values that affirm life and human potential. This goes beyond mere acceptance of moral relativism to advocate for an active and creative engagement with moral questions.

Thus, in as much as he criticizes traditional moral systems, particularly those rooted in Christianity, which he says are life-denying and promote mediocrity, he however, advocates for the creation of new values that affirm life, creativity, and individual strength. This revaluation goes beyond mere relativism by advocating for values that enhance human flourishing and vitality (Nietzsche, 1886/1966). Another way that Nietzsche attempts to go beyond relativism is by introducing the concept of *Übermensch* (Overman). The concept of the *Übermensch* represents Nietzsche's vision of a person who transcends conventional morality and creates their own values. The *Übermensch* rises above the dichotomy of good and evil, embodying a new set of values that are self-created and life-affirming. This transcendent individual represents the pinnacle of human potential and creativity (Nietzsche, 1883/1999). The *Übermensch* embraces life with all

its challenges and uncertainties, rejecting the escapism and otherworldliness of traditional moral systems. This affirmation of life is central to Nietzsche's philosophy.

Nietzsche's concept of the 'will-to-power' is a fundamental drive that underlies human behaviour and values. Unlike other philosophical systems that prioritize survival or pleasure, Nietzsche's will to power emphasizes growth, self-overcoming, and the expression of individual strength and creativity (Nietzsche, 1887/1967). The will to power is a dynamic force that drives individuals to overcome obstacles, achieve greatness, and create new values. This creative force goes beyond mere relativism by positing an active and positive principle underlying human actions and values (Nietzsche, 1886/1966).

Finally, Nietzsche's perspectivism suggests that there are no absolute truths, he also affirms the richness and diversity of perspectives. Nietzsche celebrates the multiplicity of perspectives as a source of creativity and insight. He argues that embracing multiple viewpoints can lead to a deeper and more nuanced understanding of the world (Nietzsche, 1886/1966). Nietzsche encourages individuals to actively interpret and reinterpret their experiences and values, rather than passively accepting established norms. This active engagement with one's perspective fosters personal growth and authenticity (Nietzsche, 1886/1966).

4.2. Nietzsche's Philosophy: Beyond Nihilism

Friedrich Nietzsche's philosophy encompasses much more than just nihilism, although nihilism holds a significant place within his ideas. His interaction with nihilism is complex, playing a key role in his critique of the values and morals of Western society.

4.2.1 Nietzsche's Nihilism

Friedrich Nietzsche's concept of nihilism is central to his philosophy and critiques of Western culture. Nihilism, for Nietzsche is the recognition that life lacks inherent meaning, purpose, or value, leading to a profound existential crisis. Nihilism, in Nietzsche's work, is both a diagnosis of the cultural and existential crisis of the Western

world and a critical tool for its transformation. Therefore, his interest in nihilism stems from his broader critique of Western metaphysics and religion. He argues that the foundational beliefs of Western culture, particularly those rooted in Christianity and Platonism, have led to a devaluation of life and reality. These systems, according to Nietzsche, posit a 'true' world beyond the apparent one, thereby undermining the value and significance of the immediate, lived experience (Nietzsche, 1967a).

Consequently, Nietzsche traces the genesis of nihilism to the metaphysical dualism inherent in Western philosophy. For instance, the Platonic distinction between the realm of forms and the material world introduces a hierarchy that devalues the latter. Now, Christianity, inheriting and modifying this dualism, elevates the spiritual and the afterlife at the expense of the material and the present (Nietzsche, 1999). This division, Nietzsche asserts, has cultivated a pervasive sense of meaninglessness in the actual lived world (Kaufmann, 1974).

In the *Gay Science* Nietzsche proclaims the 'death of God,' a metaphorical signification of the collapse of absolute values and the waning influence of religious and metaphysical certainties (Nietzsche, 1882). The meaning of this statement is that since, as Nietzsche says, "the belief in the 'Christian God' has become unbelievable", everything that was "built upon this faith' propped up by it, grown into it", including "the whole [...] European morality" is bound to collapse (Lanier, 2017). Nietzsche contends that the Enlightenment and the rise of scientific rationality have eroded the credibility of the divine, leaving a void in the moral and existential framework of modernity (Magnus & Higgins, 1996).

According to Nietzsche, nihilism is manifested in two forms, passive nihilism and active nihilism. Passive nihilism is characterized by a resigned acceptance of meaninglessness. It manifests in the form of despair, apathy, and a retreat into hedonism or escapism. This attitude reflects a deep-seated disillusionment with the world and a withdrawal from the pursuit of meaning or purpose (Nietzsche, 1968). Nietzsche sees this as a prevalent condition in late 19th-century European society, marked by decadence and a loss of vital energy (Danto, 1965). In contrast, active nihilism embodies a more confrontational and

transformative approach. It recognizes the collapse of old values as an opportunity to create new ones. Active nihilists reject the remnants of outdated beliefs and actively seek to overcome the void left by their dissolution. Nietzsche views this as a more positive and dynamic response, one that holds the potential for cultural and existential renewal (Nietzsche, 1967b).

4.2.2 Beyond Nihilism

Nietzsche's philosophy does not merely diagnose nihilism but also offers a path for overcoming it. As mentioned earlier, Nietzsche's concept of the will-to-power is central to overcoming nihilism. Nietzsche advanced a notion of the will to power, rather than the will to live that Schopenhauer used. What is the will to power? In brief, the will-to-power is the continual effort to overcome, which means overcoming obstacles that get in one's way and overcoming oneself. It is through the will to power that individuals can transcend nihilism, embracing life in all its complexity and striving for self-overcoming. This concept emphasizes the importance of strength, vitality, and the continual pursuit of self-improvement (Nietzsche, 1968). Thus, embracing the will to power means asserting one's own values and creating meaning through strength and creativity. By doing so, individuals can transcend nihilism, which Nietzsche sees as a passive acceptance of meaninglessness.

Besides, central to Nietzsche's project is the concept of the 'revaluation' of all values as a way of overcoming nihilism. He believes many prevailing values, especially those derived from Christianity, promote weakness and submission. To overcome nihilism, one must reject these values and create new, life-affirming ones. He challenges individuals to critically examine and overturn these inherited moral and metaphysical assumptions that perpetuate nihilism (Nietzsche, 1966). This revaluation demands a creative engagement with life, encouraging individuals to establish values that affirm their existence and experiences (Schacht, 1983).

This idea posits that life's fundamental drive is not survival or reproduction, but the expansion of power and influence. Embracing the will to power means asserting one's own values and creating meaning through strength and creativity. By doing so, individuals can transcend nihilism, which Nietzsche sees as a passive acceptance of meaninglessness.

Again, Nietzsche brings up the notion of *Übermensch*, or 'Overman,' as a key solution to overcoming nihilism. The *Übermensch* represents an individual who transcends the nihilistic void left by the collapse of traditional values and creates new values that affirm life. The *Übermensch* was first introduced in Nietzsche's work *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. Nietzsche describes the *Übermensch* as a being who has transcended the limitations of ordinary human existence and has created their own values and meaning (Nietzsche, 1999).

According to Nietzsche, the *Übermensch* embodies the will to power, which is the fundamental drive to assert and enhance one's own existence (Nietzsche, 1968). This drive compels him to continually surpass themselves, rejecting mediocrity and embracing the full spectrum of human potential. Through the will-to-power and the ideal of the *Übermensch*, Nietzsche offers a path for overcoming nihilism and affirming life in its fullest expression. In his words, Nietzsche asserts:

I teach you the overman. Man is something that shall be overcome. What have you done to overcome him? All beings so far have created something beyond themselves; and do you want to be the ebb of this great flood, and even go back to the beasts rather than overcome man? (Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, Prologue §3).

Conclusively, Nietzsche emphasizes that individuals can move beyond nihilism, finding empowerment and meaning in the assertion of their own values and the continual process of self-overcoming.

4.3. Critiques and Various Interpretations of Nietzsche's Moral Relativism

Friedrich Nietzsche's moral relativism has sparked extensive debate among scholars, leading to a wide range of interpretations and critiques. Nietzsche's rejection of absolute moral values and his emphasis on the subjective creation of values have been both lauded and criticized. Here we intend to explore the diverse perspectives on Nietzsche's moral relativism, highlighting key scholarly interpretations and critiques.

4.3.1 Subjectivism and the Creation of Values

Nietzsche's moral relativism is often interpreted as a form of subjectivism, where moral values are seen as expressions of individual or cultural perspectives. Nietzsche posits that there are no objective, universal moral truths, but rather that values are created by individuals or societies based on their own experiences and needs (Nietzsche, 1966). This view emphasizes the creative power of humans to establish their own values and meanings in life. Richard Schacht (1983) argues that Nietzsche's moral relativism is an affirmation of human creativity and autonomy.

According to Schacht, Nietzsche encourages individuals to transcend the conventional moral frameworks imposed by society and to develop their own ethical principles that reflect their unique perspectives and aspirations. But Nehamas argues that Nietzsche's emphasis on individual creativity and autonomy may lead to a kind of solipsism where individuals create values without any grounding in shared human experiences or objective reality. In his book *Nietzsche: Life as Literature*, he writes:

If values can be created out of nothing, they can be created by anybody, at any time, and to suit any purpose. In that case, it would seem, nothing is stable and all is permitted. If Nietzsche's values have no objective status, they are no better than the values he seeks to overcome. (Nehamas, 1985)

According to Christine Swanton, Nietzsche's rejection of objective moral values and his emphasis on the creation of values by individuals fails to provide a robust foundation for moral guidance and accountability. Swanton writes:

By making morality a matter of personal creation, Nietzsche avoids the constraining force of moral standards. But this may be a disadvantage if, as Nietzsche seems to think,

the social function of morality is to guide individuals and stabilize society (Swanton, 2003).

Therefore, Swanton concludes that Nietzsche's emphasis on personal creation of values overlooks the social and interpersonal dimensions of morality, which are crucial for maintaining social order and fostering moral development.

4.3.2 Moral Objectivity and Will-to-Power

In his book, *Nietzsche on Morality*, Leiter critiques Nietzsche's rejection of moral objectivity and his embrace of the will to power as the basis for value creation. Leiter argues that Nietzsche's account fails to provide a satisfactory explanation for moral disagreement and conflict. He asserts that without some constraints on interpretation, there seems no reason why any particular interpretation of any particular action should be preferred over any other. Leiter thus concludes that Nietzsche's focus on individual interpretation and creativity undermines the possibility of resolving moral disputes and achieving meaningful moral progress (Leiter, 2002).

Martin Heidegger, a German philosopher, critiques Nietzsche's concept of the will to power as being too metaphysical and anthropocentric. Heidegger argues that his emphasis on human wilfulness and domination obscures the deeper truths of existence and alienates human beings from their own being. In his own word Heidegger, says: "Nietzsche's will-to-power is ultimately a manifestation of the modern human subject's attempt to dominate and control the world, which leads to a forgetfulness of being and a loss of authenticity" (Heidegger, *Lectures on Nietzsche*, 1961).

Following the footsteps of Heidegger, a French postmodernist thinker, Gilles Deleuze, offers a solid critique of Nietzsche's concept of the will-to-power as being too metaphysical and totalizing. He judges Nietzsche's emphasis on the will-to-power as the underlying force of all phenomena that may lead to a reductionist and deterministic view of reality (Deleuze, 1962).

4.3.3 Master and Slave Morality

Nietzsche's views on master and slave morality have received various critiques from scholars. Bernard Williams, for instance, in his book, *Nietzsche: The Ethics of an Immoralist*, critiques Nietzsche's characterization of master and slave morality as overly simplistic and historically inaccurate. Williams argues that Nietzsche's dichotomy fails to capture the complexity and diversity of moral phenomena across different cultures and historical periods. He asserts that "the Nietzschean contrast between master and slave morality is a schematic over-simplification, reflecting Nietzsche's own highly idiosyncratic reading of history" (Williams, 1995). According to him, Nietzsche's portrayal of the contrast between master and slave morality neglects important nuances and variations in moral outlooks and practices.

Again, Alexander Nehamas critiques Nietzsche's interpretation of slave morality as solely based on resentment and weakness. He argues that Nietzsche overlooks the positive aspects of slave morality, such as its emphasis on compassion and solidarity. Nehamas' emphasis is that "Slave morality is not simply a form of weakness and resentment; it also involves a positive valuation of certain virtues, such as compassion and humility, that Nietzsche fails to appreciate" (Nehamas, 1985). Nehamas suggests that Nietzsche's one-sided portrayal of slave morality neglects its moral achievements and contributions to human flourishing.

Similarly, in her book, *Virtue Ethics: A Pluralistic View*, Christine Swanton critiques Nietzsche's dichotomy between master and slave morality as overly dualistic and reductive. Swanton argues that Nietzsche fails to recognize the diversity of moral perspectives and the possibility of integrating elements of both master and slave morality into a more nuanced ethical framework. She asserts that "Nietzsche's dichotomy between master and slave morality is too simplistic and fails to capture the complexity of moral life, which often involves a mixture of different moral attitudes and values" (Swanton, 2003). Swanton, therefore, argues that Nietzsche's binary opposition between master and slave morality obscures the plurality of moral experiences and perspectives.

4.3.4 Ethical Nihilism and the Danger of Relativism

Some scholars have had concern on the question of ethical nihilism and the danger of relativism. One of the primary critiques of Nietzsche's moral relativism is that it can lead to ethical nihilism – the belief that all values are baseless and that nothing is inherently meaningful. Critics argue that if all moral values are relative and subjective, then there is no foundation for distinguishing between right and wrong, leading to a potential erosion of ethical standards. Brian Leiter (2002), for instance, argues that Nietzsche's rejection of absolute moral values poses a challenge for establishing any coherent ethical system. Leiter asserts that Nietzsche's perspectivism, while offering a critique of traditional moral frameworks, does not provide a viable alternative for grounding moral judgments, potentially resulting in moral chaos and nihilism (Leiter 2002).

4.3.5 The Concept of the *Übermensch*

Again, Nietzsche's concept of the *Übermensch* and his critique of slave morality have also been criticized for promoting elitism and disregarding the needs of the broader society. Some scholars argue that Nietzsche's celebration of individual greatness and self-overcoming can lead to a justification of power and domination over others. Jürgen Habermas (1995) for example, critiques Nietzsche's moral relativism for its potential to resurrect a form of social Darwinism, where the strong dominate the weak. Habermas argues that Nietzsche's emphasis on individual excellence and the revaluation of values risks undermining the principles of equality and justice that are essential for a cohesive and fair society (Habermas 1995).

4.3.6 Potential Misinterpretations of Nietzsche's Thought

A couple of scholars argue that the critiques of Nietzsche's moral relativism often stem from misinterpretations or decontextualized readings of his works. They claim that Nietzsche's philosophy is not a total rejection of all moral values but a call for the revaluation of existing values in light of their historical and cultural contexts.

One common misinterpretation is viewing Nietzsche's *Übermensch* as advocating for a kind of superhuman or elitist figure. While Nietzsche does speak of the *Übermensch* as someone who transcends conventional morality, he emphasizes the potential for every

individual to strive towards self-overcoming and the realization of their own unique potential. The *Übermensch* is not a literal superhuman but rather a symbol of human potentiality and self-mastery (Nietzsche, 1885). Nietzsche writes:

I teach you the Overman. Man is something that shall be overcome. What have you done to overcome him? All beings so far have created something beyond themselves; and do you want to be the ebb of this great flood, and even go back to the beasts rather than overcome man? (Nietzsche, Prologue, §3, 1885).

Nietzsche is often associated with nihilism, but his philosophy is more accurately seen as a response to nihilism rather than an endorsement of it. Nietzsche critiques the passive nihilism that arises from the collapse of traditional values but seeks to overcome it by advocating for the creation of new, life-affirming values. He encourages a reevaluation of existing values rather than a wholesale rejection of meaning and purpose. (Nietzsche, 1885)

Finally, Alexander Nehamas (1985) argues that Nietzsche's moral relativism is often misunderstood as advocating for moral anarchy. He emphasizes that Nietzsche's project is fundamentally constructive, aiming to develop new forms of value and meaning that are more authentic and life-affirming than those of traditional moral systems. (Nehamas, 1985).

All in all, Nietzsche's moral relativism continues to generate diverse interpretations and critiques. As argued above, some scholars view it as a liberating call for individual creativity and the reevaluation of values, while others criticize it for its potential to lead to ethical nihilism and elitism. These varying perspectives highlight the complexity and enduring relevance of Nietzsche's thought in contemporary moral philosophy.

4.3.7 Concluding Remarks

This chapter has attempted to analyse Nietzsche's moral relativism, particularly the idea of nihilism. After looking at the general understanding of moral relativism, this section has defined the key tenets of moral relativism and situated Nietzsche's philosophy within this

framework. Further, the study has dealt with the idea of moral objectivism outlining its main principles and distinguishes it from moral relativism. Finally, the fourth chapter has looked at the critique and various interpretations of Nietzsche's moral relativism. The next chapter embarks on same-sex relations as a contemporary moral issue.

CHAPTER FIVE

SAME-SEX SEXUAL RELATIONS AS A CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISSUE

5.1 Historical Overview of Same-sex Relations

Throughout human history, the spectrum of sexual orientation and gender identity has been diverse and fluid, reflecting the complexity of human experience. Same-sex relationships – though often marginalized or condemned in various societies – have existed across cultures and epochs, shaping and reflecting societal attitudes, norms, and legal frameworks (Boswell, 1980). Understanding the historical context of same-sex relations provides insights into the evolution of human sexuality and the struggle for acceptance and equality.

5.1.1 Ancient Times

In many ancient cultures, same-sex sexual relations were documented and, in some cases, accepted or even celebrated. While direct evidence of same-sex relations in ancient Mesopotamia is limited, scholars have interpreted certain texts, such as the Epic of Gilgamesh, as containing homoerotic themes. For instance, in Tablet II of the epic, the close relationship between Gilgamesh and Enkidu has been analysed by scholars as potentially homoerotic, (Snell, 2010), suggesting that their bond goes beyond mere friendship. Similarly, in ancient Greece, sexual relationships between adult men and adolescent boys – known as pederasty – were socially acknowledged and played a role in the social and educational development of young men. Additionally, same-sex relations were celebrated in Greek mythology and literature, with figures like Achilles and Patroclus often depicted as lovers (Dover, 1978).

The earliest documented same-sex relationship can be traced back to ancient Egypt, located in Africa. This couple, Khnumhotep and Niankhkhnum, existed around 2400 BCE. Munthali (2023) notes that they are shown in Egyptian art in a close and affectionate embrace known as ‘nose-kissing,’ which was considered the most intimate form of depiction at that time. Similarly, in ancient Greece, homosexuality was also viewed as acceptable under certain conditions. Zive (n.d.) highlights that the Greek

philosopher Plato, as cited by Boswell (1979), presented comparable viewpoints on the matter.

Homosexuality is regarded as shameful by barbarians and by those who live under despotic governments just as philosophy is regarded as shameful by them, because it is apparently not in the interest of such rulers to have great ideas engendered in their subjects, or powerful friendships or passionate love-all of which homosexuality is particularly apt to produce (Boswell (1979) .

For the Romans, acceptance was relatively mild, much like it was for the Greeks, until the rise and widespread adoption of Christianity in Rome.

According to some researchers, ancient Rome had a more pragmatic approach to sexuality, where same-sex relations were relatively common, particularly between older men and younger boys or male slaves (Williams, 1999), although attitudes toward these relations varied. While some Romans condemned homosexuality, others, like the emperor Hadrian, engaged in same-sex relationships openly. Hadrian's relationship with Antinous, a young Greek man, is one of the most well-known examples (Halperin, 1995). Some Chinese scholars have also affirmed that homosexuality existed in ancient Chinese society, with references found in literature, poetry, and historical records. The concept of 'male love' (*nanai*) was present in Chinese culture, although attitudes toward it varied over time and across different regions (Wu, 2008). Various indigenous societies globally have long acknowledged same-sex partnerships, often integrating these relationships into their cultural or spiritual customs. Examples include certain Native American tribes and Pacific Island cultures (Roscoe, 1996).

5.1.2 The Middle Ages

Hitherto, the advent of Christianity brought significant changes to the perception of same-sex relations. With the rise of the Christian Church in the Roman Empire, homosexual acts began to be viewed as sinful. This shift was evident in the writings of early Christian theologians such as Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, who condemned same-sex relations as contrary to natural law (Boswell, 1980). During the medieval

period, laws across Europe increasingly criminalized same-sex acts, often under the category of ‘sodomy,’ which could also encompass other non-procreative sexual acts. Furthermore, legal frameworks played a significant role in shaping attitudes towards same-sex relationships during this period. In his work, James A. Brundages highlights the intricate interplay between ecclesiastical and secular laws in regulating sexual behaviour, shedding light on the complexities of medieval attitudes towards homosexuality (Brundages, 1990). In her study, Ruth Mazo Karras gives the evidence of same-sex desire among women in the Middle Ages. She challenges the notion of lesbian invisibility in medieval Europe, presenting instances where such relationships were acknowledged and documented in various historical sources (Karras, 1991). McGrady offers a comprehensive survey of recent scholarship on medieval sexualities, including same-sex relations. McGrady’s analysis underscores the diversity of experiences and attitudes towards sexuality in pre-modern Europe, emphasizing the importance of interdisciplinary approaches in understanding this complex aspect of medieval society (McGrady, 2004). Unlike in the ancient times, same-sex relations in the Middle Ages had a negative connotation all together.

5.1.3 Early Modern Period

The Renaissance and Enlightenment periods saw some intellectual debates about sexuality, but laws against same-sex relations remained stringent. For instance, the Buggery Act of 1533 in England made anal intercourse punishable by death (Crompton, 2003). Despite the harsh penalties, some individuals, particularly in artistic and intellectual circles, continued to explore same-sex relationships discreetly. For example, historian Rictor Norton has compiled numerous primary sources documenting same-sex relationships in Europe during this period (Crompton, 2003).

In contrast to Europe, the Ottoman Empire had a more tolerant attitude towards same-sex relations – at least in certain contexts. Scholarly research, such as Khaled El-Rouayheb’s work, has shown that same-sex relationships were not uncommon in the Ottoman Empire, and there were even legal and social frameworks for recognizing and regulating these relationships. The Ottoman legal system did not specifically criminalize same-sex

relations in the same way that European legal systems did during this period. While there were laws regulating sexual conduct, they were often concerned with issues such as adultery and public decency rather than specifically targeting homosexuality (Rouayheb, 2009).

5.1.4 19th and Early 20th Centuries

The 19th and early 20th centuries saw the pathologization of same-sex attraction, with emerging medical and psychological fields classifying homosexuality as a mental disorder. This period also witnessed the first organized movements for homosexual rights. Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, a German lawyer, is often regarded as the first person to publicly campaign for gay rights in the 1860s (Kennedy, 1997). Meanwhile, the trial of Oscar Wilde in 1895 brought significant public attention to issues of homosexuality in England, highlighting the severe social and legal penalties homosexuals faced (Adut, 2005).

During these centuries, same-sex relationships were often criminalized and stigmatized, leading to legal persecution and social ostracism. For instance, sodomy laws were enforced to punish individuals engaged in same-sex behaviour. Despite persecution, early forms of LGBTQ+ activism began to emerge in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Organizations such as the Mattachine Society and the Daughters of Bilitis laid the groundwork for later LGBTQ+ rights movements (Bravmann, 2019).

5.1.5 Mid to Late 20th Century

The mid-20th century saw a significant shift with the emergence of the gay liberation movement. The 1969 Stonewall Riots in New York City are frequently mentioned as the spark of the contemporary LGBTQ rights campaign. This led to the creation of multiple advocacy organizations and the annual Pride Month festivities. Decriminalizing same-sex acts between consenting adults picked up momentum, with England and Wales taking such steps in 1967. Extra efforts to support LGBTQ rights emerged steadily following these landmark events.

The mid to late 20th century witnessed the emergence of LGBTQ+ activism and advocacy movements, spurred by social injustices and the desire for equal rights and recognition (Carter, 2004). Legal battles challenging anti-sodomy laws and advocating for LGBTQ+ rights gained momentum during this period. Landmark cases such as *Lawrence v. Texas* (2003) overturned sodomy laws in the United States, affirming the rights of consenting adults to engage in private, same-sex relationships (Supreme Court of the United States, 2003).

5.2 Legal Stances

This section intends to analyse the current legal stances and Catholic Church teachings on same-sex relations, globally and specifically in Kenya. In the recent decades, there has been significant progress in the recognition and acceptance of same-sex relationships in many countries.

5.2.1 Global Legal Stances on Same-sex Relations

The legal status of same-sex relations varies significantly across different regions of the world. This overview provides a snapshot of the legal recognition and criminalization of same-sex relationships globally. Many countries have legalized same-sex marriage, beginning with the Netherlands in 2001, followed by numerous other nations across Europe, the Americas, and beyond (Waaldijk, 2001). In the early 21st century, visibility and representation of LGBTQ people in media and politics, as well as other public areas, have increased. The legal standing of same-gender partnerships has changed. Numerous countries have passed laws recognizing same-sex marriages and protecting LGBTQ rights.

5.2.1.1 Africa

In recent years, several African nations have progressed in legalizing LGBTQ rights. South Africa has led the way, being the first in Africa and the fifth globally to legalize same-sex marriage in 2006. The nation's constitution specifically forbids discrimination related to sexual orientation. Section 9, titled Equality, clearly states that the state must

not unjustly discriminate against anyone on various grounds, including sexual orientation.

These strides mark significant progress in the recognition and enforcement of LGBTQ rights within the continent. The relevant part of Section 9, entitled ‘Equality,’ explicitly states that the state may not unfairly discriminate against anyone on various grounds, including sexual orientation. This section ensures that LGBTQ+ individuals are protected from both vertical (state) and horizontal (private individuals and organizations) discrimination. Other African countries who have legalized LGBTQ+ individuals are, Lesotho (2010), Mozambique (2015), Seychelles (2016), Botswana (2019), Angola (2021) and Mauritius (2023). However, many African countries criminalize same-sex relations. For instance, in Uganda, the Anti-Homosexuality Act imposes severe penalties for same-sex acts (Human Rights Watch, 2024).

5.2.1.2 Asia

Asia presents a mixed picture regarding the legality of same-sex relations. Generally, the legal status of same-sex relations varies across differently Asian countries. On the one hand, it has what they call ‘progressive’ stances and on the other hand there are ‘regressive’ stances. Among the progressive stances, there is Taiwan which was the first Asian country to legalize same-sex marriage in 2019. Additionally, in 2023, Taiwan lifted restrictions on same-sex marriages involving foreign nationals and granted full adoption rights to same-sex couples. (International IDEA) (Human Rights Watch).

In 2023, Nepal made significant strides by ordering the legal registration of same-sex marriages, marking a historic first in South Asia. While same-sex relations were never criminalized, Vietnam's Health Ministry declared in 2022 that homosexuality is not an illness, a step toward reducing stigma and discrimination. In Jordan, Consensual same-sex relations have been decriminalized since 1951. However, LGBTQ+ individuals still face significant harassment and discrimination due to other ambiguous morality laws. In Singapore, Singapore repealed a colonial-era law that banned gay sex, although it simultaneously amended the constitution to limit marriage to heterosexual couples in

2022. India decriminalized same-sex relations in 2018, marking a significant step forward in LGBTQ+ rights (Human Right Watch)

In Malaysia, on the regressive side, same-sex relations remain criminalized under colonial-era laws, with severe penalties including imprisonment and corporal punishment. This is the same case with Afghanistan and Maldives. Both countries maintain strict prohibitions against same-sex relations, often punishing individuals under broad interpretations of Islamic law.

5.2.1.3 Europe

Europe typically holds the most progressive views on same-sex relationships. Many nations in Western Europe, such as the Netherlands, Spain, and those in the Nordic region, have legalized same-sex marriage and have significant protections for LGBTQ individuals. The Netherlands was pioneering in 2000, being the first to allow same-sex marriage, a trend followed by many other countries. In the United States, the 2015 Supreme Court ruling in *Obergefell v. Hodges* allowed same-sex marriage across all states, marking a pivotal point in LGBTQ rights advocacy.

In contrast, Eastern Europe presents a mixed picture. For example, Russia has strict laws against gay propaganda, curtailing LGBTQ rights significantly. Same-sex relationship recognition is less common, with countries like Poland and Hungary placing legal restrictions on LGBTQ individuals. However, places like the Czech Republic provide registered partnerships

5.2.1.4 North America

In North America, marriage for same-sex couples is lawful in Canada and the U.S. Canada leads in LGBTQ rights, offering solid protections against bias. In 2015, the U.S. made same-sex marriage legal across the country. However, state laws differ on other LGBTQ rights. Policymakers maintain efforts to address these disparities. Human Rights Watch, 2024.

5.2.1.5 South America

South America has made significant strides in LGBTQ+ rights, with countries like Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay legalizing same-sex marriage and enacting anti-discrimination laws. However, some countries still have conservative stances, and societal acceptance can vary widely (Human Rights Watch, 2024).

5.2.1.6 Oceania

In Oceania, Australia and New Zealand are notable for their progressive stances on LGBTQ+ rights, both having legalized same-sex marriage. In contrast, many Pacific Island nations still criminalize same-sex relations, although there is a growing movement towards decriminalization in some areas, such as Fiji (Human Rights Watch, 2024).

5.2.2 Same-sex Relations: Kenyan Situation

Same-sex relations in Kenya are a complex and highly contentious issue, influenced by cultural, religious, legal as well as social factors. The demographic information of a study conducted by (Egunjobi et. al, 2023) showed that 1 in 10 Kenyans identified having a same-sex attraction. This section aims to explore the general situation of same-sex relation in Kenya, looking at social attitudes and the general challenges faced by the LGBTQ+ community in Kenya. The attitudes towards same-sex relations in Kenya are deeply rooted in the country's colonial history and cultural traditions. During the colonial period, the British imposed laws criminalizing same-sex relations, which were subsequently enshrined in the Kenyan Penal Code. These laws reflected Victorian-era morality rather than indigenous African traditions, which often had more nuanced understandings of gender and sexuality (Murray & Roscoe, 1998)

Legal Landscape of the Same-sex relations in Kenya

Same-sex relations are criminalized under sections 162 and 165 of the Kenyan Penal Code. These sections describe 'carnal knowledge against the order of nature' and 'indecent practices between males' which are interpreted to include same-sex sexual acts. These laws can result in up to 14 years of imprisonment for those found guilty (Human Rights Watch, 2015). There have been efforts to challenge the legality of sections of the

Penal Code that criminalize same-sex relationships. Activists and civil organizations have brought cases to the Kenyan courts, arguing that these laws violate constitutional rights to privacy, equality, and non-discrimination. However, as of the latest rulings, these laws have been upheld by the courts (Kenya Human Rights Commission, 2019). Thus, despite occasional calls for decriminalization of same-sex relations, these laws remain in place, supported by significant portions of the population and political leaders in Kenya.

Social Stigma and Discrimination

Despite a Supreme Court ruling in February 2023 that granted the LGBTQ+ community the legal right to register associations, significant opposition persists among the general populace and political leaders in Kenya. Thus, same-sex relationships are heavily stigmatized in Kenya. Societal attitudes are largely influenced by conservative cultural and religious beliefs, which view homosexuality as immoral and unacceptable. This stigma manifests in various forms, including social exclusion, verbal harassment, and physical violence (Andrikopoulos & Spronk, 2023). In fact, the president including some citizens were said to disagree with the Supreme Court's judgement (Omondi, 2023).

Different surveys indicate that a substantial portion of Kenyans harbour negative views towards LGBTQ+ individuals, viewing them as abnormal or against cultural and religious norms. For instance, a study conducted by Research Scientific Innovation Society (RSIS) on Kenyans' attitude towards the formation of LGBTQ+ associations, revealed that 80.5% of respondents acknowledged the stigmatization faced by LGBTQ+ individuals. Stigma often leads to social isolation, discrimination, and even familial disownment (RSIS International). Similarly, according to a 2013 Pew Research Centre survey, 90% of Kenyans believe that homosexuality should not be accepted by the Kenyan society (Pew Research Centre, 2013).

However, the research also acknowledged that the lack of comprehensive data on the prevalence of same-sex attraction in Kenya contributes to the ambiguity and resistance. Estimates suggest that about 10.8% of Kenyans might experience same-sex attraction, but societal pressure keeps many from openly identifying as LGBTQ+ (RSIS International).

Overall, while legal advancements like the Supreme Court ruling represent progress, significant societal change is required to address the entrenched stigma and opposition faced by the LGBTQ+ community in Kenya.

Challenges Faced by the LGBTQ+ Community in Kenya

With such a complex situation in regard to same-sex relations in Kenya, it is uncommon not to face obvious challenges from different horizons. Firstly, the criminalization of same-sex relations leads to widespread discrimination and harassment by law enforcement agencies. Many LGBTQ+ individuals are reluctant to report crimes or seek legal assistance due to fear of arrest. Secondly, LGBTQ+ individuals often face ostracization from their families and communities. There are frequent reports of violence, including physical assaults, corrective rape, and even murder. Such incidents are rarely prosecuted, contributing to a climate of impunity (Human Rights Watch, 2015).

Further, these groups face significant health disparities, partly due to stigma and discrimination within the healthcare system. Many are reluctant to seek medical help, and there is limited access to HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment services tailored to the needs of LGBTQ+ people (UNAIDS, 2019). Very often, the groups also experience economic marginalization with many LGBTQ+ individuals facing job loss, harassment, or refusal of service. This economic marginalization further exacerbates their vulnerability (Human Rights Watch, 2015).

Efforts towards Change

Despite the challenges, there are notable efforts to improve the situation for the LGBTQ+ community in Kenya. There is continuous advocacy attempts by various organizations. For instance, organizations like NGLHRC continue to challenge discriminatory laws and practices through the courts. While progress is slow, there have been some victories, such as the 2015 court ruling that allowed an LGBTQ+ rights group to register as a non-governmental organization (Kenya High Court, 2015). Secondly, there is also public awareness. Efforts to change public perceptions through media, education, and cultural events are ongoing. These campaigns aim to promote acceptance and understanding of

LGBTQ+ individuals (GALCK, 2020). Finally, International organizations and foreign governments provide support through funding, advocacy, and diplomatic pressure. This support is crucial in sustaining local LGBTQ+ initiatives and pushing for legal and social reforms (Amnesty International, 2020).

However, as we noted earlier, same-sex relations in Kenya remain a highly contentious issue, deeply intertwined with cultural, religious, and legal factors. While the LGBTQ+ community continues to face significant challenges, there are ongoing efforts to advocate for their rights and improve their living conditions. Legal reforms, public awareness campaigns, and international support are essential in fostering a more inclusive and accepting society in Kenya.

5.2.2.2 Supreme Court's Ruling NGLHRC as an NGO

The Supreme Court of Kenya's ruling on the registration of the National Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission (NGLHRC) as an NGO, delivered in February 2023, marked a significant legal milestone. The decision affirmed the rights of LGBTQ individuals to form associations, emphasizing the constitutional guarantee of freedom of association under Article 36. This ruling has important implications for LGBTQ rights advocacy in Kenya, where homosexual conduct remains criminalized under Section 162 of the Penal Code.

The Supreme Court, by a narrow 3-2 decision, found that denying registration to the National Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission (NGLHRC) based on its members' sexual orientation was unconstitutional (Daily Nation, 2023). The court underscored that all Kenyan citizens, irrespective of their sexual orientation, have the right to associate and form organizations to advocate for their rights and welfare (Kenya Law Reports, 2023). This legal victory provides a platform for greater visibility and support for LGBTQ rights, bolstering efforts to combat discrimination and seek legal and social reforms (Human Rights Watch, 2023).

The Supreme Court of Kenya's decision to permit the NGLHRC to register as an NGO has sparked substantial criticism across multiple segments of Kenyan society (Al Jazeera, 2023). This controversy underscores the intricate legal, cultural, and religious dimensions within the nation. President William Ruto has been one of the ruling's most outspoken critics, grounding his opposition in the cultural and religious beliefs that see homosexuality as incompatible with Kenyan values (Nation Africa, 2023). Ruto contends that the decision conflicts with the country's ethos, which largely does not support same-sex relationships.

This sentiment is echoed by many Kenyans, especially those holding conservative cultural and religious views, leading to intense public debate and protests (BBC News, 2023). Both online and offline spaces have amplified homophobic sentiments, reflecting broad societal discomfort with the judicial ruling. Religious leaders from various faiths, including Christian and Muslim communities, have denounced the decision, arguing it conflicts with religious teachings and undermines traditional family values (The Standard, 2023). Statements from religious institutions like the Catholic Church emphasize that the ruling could lead to moral degradation (The Star, 2023).

Some critics fear that recognizing LGBTQ rights legally could heighten social tensions and increase violence against the LGBTQ community (Conrad & Kahan, 2020). They argue that, rather than promoting inclusivity, the ruling may polarize society further (McBride, 2019). While the decision marks a significant legal advance for LGBTQ rights, the criticisms highlight enduring substantial challenges (The Global Risks Report, 2023). The debate continues to centre on balancing constitutional rights with cultural and religious norms, necessitating dialogue and efforts to create an inclusive environment where human rights and cultural values coexist (American Psychological Association, 2022).

5.2.2.3 Same-Sex Relations as Fashion and as a Source of Financial Support

In Kenya, research on same-sex relationships among the youth indicates shifts in sexual preferences, which are also linked to economic conditions (Muthoni, 2021). As some young individuals reconcile their sexual identities, they may view same-sex relationships as a source of financial assistance, especially during challenging financial situations (Abdi et al., 2020).

The rise of these relationships is part of a broader pattern where material needs are closely intertwined with individual identities (Okonji, 2019). Many youths are increasingly drawn to what are known as "*sponyo*" relationships, which usually involve monetary exchanges and may feature significant age differences between partners (Ochieng, 2022). This reflects a noteworthy response to shifting economic pressures that drive individuals into various types of dependency, alongside evolving norms about support systems (Karanja, 2023).

Research shows that lack of financial resources and unemployment are steering today's youth toward relationships that can provide them with financial benefits (Wamalwa, 2022). Studies also suggest that young people increasingly assess relationships, including same-sex ones, through an economic lens (Ngugi, 2021). This perspective is particularly crucial for those who have experienced exclusion from traditional family structures upon coming out, as they seek financial security in alternative settings (Maina, 2020). Thus, necessity blends with desire, intertwining affection and economic reliance.

Furthermore, urban areas are witnessing a growing acceptance of same-sex relationships as part of lifestyle and fashion choices (Omondi, 2023). The surge of gender-neutral and avant-garde styles may be influenced by global pop culture, allowing young people to embrace more flexible forms of identity (Wangu, 2021). Within the urban areas, for instance, youth belonging to the LGBTQ+ communities express their identity through fashion— not only to be noticed but to convert such visibility into financial backing (Njeri, 2022). Nonetheless, this dual reality is where same-sex relationships can signify both personal fulfillment and a means of survival.

The implications of these factors are fundamental. They present a demand that society rethink the perception and support of young people's relationships, because at this time, apart from the economic pressure, there is also an identity quest (Wamalwa, 2023). If fashion is becoming a means of self-expression, then maybe it can also be a means toward sensitization and awareness among the populace in addressing the issue (Ngugi, 2021).

5.3 Catholic Church Stances on Same-sex Relations

The Catholic Church's position on same-sex relations is deeply rooted in its moral and theological teachings, which draw upon scripture, tradition, and natural law (Vatican, 1986). The Church's stance has remained consistent over time, emphasizing the sanctity of marriage between one man and one woman and the importance of chastity for all individuals, including those with same-sex attractions (Catechism of the Catholic Church, 2019). This stance has been a subject of controversy and debate both within and outside the Church (USCCB, n.d.).

The Church maintains that same-sex relations contradict its teachings and the natural law, viewing marriage solely as a union between a man and a woman (USCCB, n.d.). As a result, this perspective forms the basis for the Church's opposition to same-sex marriage and its associated unions (Vatican, 1986).

With ongoing debates about inclusivity within religious communities, the Catholic Church's traditional views on sexuality and the nature of marriage continue to spark significant discussions about LGBTQ rights, reflecting the complexities of balancing faith with contemporary societal values (Nairobi Wire, 2024).

5.3.1 Same-sex Relations in Christian Tradition

The term "sodomy" stems from the Bible, particularly the tale of Sodom and Gomorrah in Genesis 19:5, linked to homosexuality. Leviticus 18:22 distinctly condemns homosexuality, calling it an abomination, while chapter 20:13 states such acts should lead to death. In the New Testament, multiple passages also express disapproval of

homosexuality, such as Romans 1:26-28, Jude 1:7, and 1 Corinthians 6:9. By AD 533, Emperor Justinian declared homosexuality completely illegal, punishable by castration (Bullough, 1979).

Different faiths and their leaders hold varied stances on homosexuality. Prominent Church figures like Thomas Aquinas regarded it as the gravest of sexual sins, opposing the natural order set by God. However, contemporary Christian views on homosexuality and sexual orientation differ widely. Some scholars now dispute that scriptures clearly describe homosexuality as a sin against God (Koenig & Dykman, 2012).

5.3.1.1 Doctrinal Basis

The Church's view on sexuality, including same-sex relationships, is deeply rooted in natural law theory, which holds that moral guidelines stem from human nature and purpose. St. Thomas Aquinas posited that sexual acts are morally right when they align with their natural purpose, which includes procreation and the union of husband and wife. Consequently, the Catholic Church's teachings on same-sex relationships revolve around its interpretation of marriage and sexuality.

According to Church beliefs, marriage is a sacrament created by God, aimed at being a lifelong union between a man and a woman, open to procreation and child-rearing. This viewpoint is based on biblical references such as Genesis 1:27-28 and Genesis 2:24, where marriage is described as a union between a man and a woman, as well as New Testament teachings, for example, Matthew 19:4-6.

5.3.1.2 The Catechism of the Catholic Church

The Catechism of the Catholic Church provides an extensive outline of Catholic beliefs, including views on same-sex attraction and relations. It mentions that homosexual acts are inherently flawed and against natural law (CCC 2357). The Catechism makes a clear distinction between homosexual orientation, which is not sinful, and homosexual acts, considered sinful. This belief stems from the idea that sexual relations should be open to the possibility of producing life, and same-sex acts deviate from this natural rule.

Paragraph 2358 highlights that individuals with same-sex attractions should be treated with respect, compassion, and sensitivity. Any form of unjust discrimination against them is to be avoided. This aligns with the Church's teaching on the inherent worth of every person, emphasizing the significance of treating all individuals with love and respect regardless of their sexual orientation.

5.3.1.3 Dicastery for Doctrine on Faith on Same-sex relations

The Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith (DDF), formerly the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF), is an entity within the Roman Catholic Church. Its mission is to uphold and safeguard teachings related to faith and morals. The DDF has periodically issued pronouncements concerning same-sex relationships, outlining the Church's official stance. It has guided the Catholic Church in supporting homosexual individuals. The Catechism of the Catholic Church (CCC) differentiates between homosexual inclination and homosexual actions. The former is not considered sinful; however, the latter is deemed morally incorrect. The directive emphasizes that people with homosexual tendencies should be approached with respect, compassion, and sensitivity, and stresses that unjust discrimination is unacceptable. Additionally, it advises against groups promoting homosexual behaviour and calls for pastoral care consistent with the Church's views on sexuality.

Regarding the question of legal recognition of same-sex unions, the DDF opposes granting such status. They argue that recognizing these unions undermines traditional marriage, defined as a relationship between one man and one woman. According to the DDF, same-sex unions do not meet the natural purposes of marriage, such as having children and raising them. As a result, the Dicastery urges Catholic politicians to resist laws that recognize these unions.

In response to a query about blessing same-sex unions, the DDF firmly stated that the Church does not possess the authority to bless such unions. Their response emphasized that the Church cannot bless sin. It reaffirmed the Church's doctrine that God cannot bless sinful actions, and therefore, blessings do not extend to relationships involving sexual

activities outside the confines of marriage between a man and a woman (DDF, 2021). These positions highlight the Church's commitment to its longstanding teachings on marriage.

5.3.1.4 Genera Pastoral Care

The DDF has consistently called for pastoral approaches that respect the dignity of individuals with homosexual tendencies while remaining faithful to the Church's teachings on sexuality. It emphasizes the importance of providing spiritual support and guidance to help individuals live according to Church teachings (CDF, 1986; 2003; 2021).

Therefore, while the Church maintains its doctrinal stance on same-sex relations, it also recognizes the need for pastoral care and support for individuals with same-sex attractions. Various Catholic organizations and ministries offer support, counselling, and spiritual guidance to individuals who experience same-sex attractions, promoting chastity and a life of celibacy in line with Church teaching.

5.3.2 The Catholic Church in Kenya

The Catholic Church in Kenya steadfastly opposes same-sex relationships, reflecting its doctrinal beliefs and the country's widespread cultural and religious views. Archbishop Hubertus van Megen, the Apostolic Nuncio to Kenya and South Sudan, clearly stated that the Church does not approve of same-sex unions (Nairobi Wire, 2024). This aligns with the traditional church teachings that define marriage as only between one man and one woman (Catechism of the Catholic Church, 2019).

Globally, the Catholic doctrine holds a similar stance, opposing sexual relationships outside heterosexual marriage (Vatican, 1986). The Kenya Conference of Catholic Bishops (KCCB) has repeatedly reinforced this doctrine, particularly in response to recent controversies and Pope Francis's statements about the pastoral care of LGBTQ individuals (Kenya News, 2024). Despite some interpretations suggesting a more inclusive view, Kenyan Catholic bishops emphasize that the Pope's words do not mean

approval of same-sex unions. They maintain that the Church cannot bless these relationships, considering them irregular and not aligned with their faith's teachings (Al Jazeera, 2023).

Recently, confusion arose over Pope Francis's stance on same-sex blessings. While the Pope has stressed that the Church should welcome everyone (AP News, 2023), Kenyan bishops quickly clarified that this inclusivity does not mean recognizing or blessing same-sex unions (Reuters, 2024). Archbishop Philip Anyolo of Nairobi explicitly forbade clergy from blessing same-sex couples, supporting the broader African Catholic leadership's rejection of any such measures introduced by the Vatican (Al Jazeera, 2023). This strong stance highlights a broader cultural context where same-sex relationships are socially and legally disapproved. Kenyan society, deeply influenced by conservative cultural and religious norms, often views LGBTQ rights with suspicion and disapproval (AP News, 2023). The Catholic Church's position thus echoes the prevailing public sentiment, reinforcing the traditional family structure and the view of marriage as heteronormative (Shafer-Landau, 2012).

The Church's position has major impacts on LGBTQ advocacy in Kenya. While LGBTQ groups strive for recognition and equal rights, including wins like the Supreme Court's ruling allowing the registration of the National Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission as an NGO (Al Jazeera, 2023), they face strong opposition from established religious institutions. The Catholic Church's resistance reminds us that legal progress often battles with deep-rooted cultural and religious beliefs, making the journey to equality complex and multi-faceted (Nussbaum, 2011).

In short, the Catholic Church in Kenya remains firm in its opposition to same-sex relations and unions, adhering to traditional Christian teachings and reflecting the broader cultural conservatism in the country. This stance, constantly reaffirmed by church leaders, underscores the strong influence of religious doctrine on societal values and legal interpretations in Kenya (Harman, 1977).

5.3.3 Contemporary Challenges and Debates on Same-Sex Marriage in the Catholic Church

The issue of same-sex marriage within the Catholic Church is a complex and contentious topic that has generated significant debate among theologians, clergy, and laypeople. This debate is influenced by various theological, ethical, social, and pastoral considerations. Consequently, the Catholic Church's stance on same-sex relations has faced increasing scrutiny and criticism in contemporary society, particularly as attitudes toward homosexuality have evolved in many parts of the world. Some within the Church advocate for a more inclusive approach, calling for greater recognition of the love and commitment present in same-sex relationships. Others argue for a reaffirmation of traditional teachings, emphasizing the importance of upholding the sanctity of marriage and the moral law.

- **Theological and Doctrinal Challenges**

Traditional interpretations of biblical texts have been used to argue against same-sex relationships, citing passages from Leviticus, Romans, and Corinthians. However, some theologians argue for a re-interpretation of these texts, emphasizing the context in which they were written and proposing more inclusive understandings (Boswell, 1980).

- **Natural Law Theory Challenges**

The Catholic Church's teachings on marriage are heavily influenced by natural law theory, which posits that marriage is inherently ordered towards procreation and the union of a man and a woman (Catechism of the Catholic Church, 1992). This presents a significant challenge to the acceptance of same-sex marriage, as it does not conform to this traditional understanding (Jones, 2017).

- ***Ethical and Moral Considerations***

Proponents advocating for same-sex marriages within the Church argue that denying these couples the right to marry violates their basic human dignity and equality (Farley 2006). They believe that everyone, regardless of their sexual orientation, deserves the right to build loving and committed relationships.

- **Pastoral Care and Inclusion:**

There is a growing emphasis on the need for pastoral care that is inclusive and affirming of LGBTQ+ individuals. Some clergy and laypeople believe that the Church should find ways to bless same-sex unions, even if they are not recognized as sacramental marriages (Bourke, 2015).

- ***Social and Cultural Dynamics***

There have been constant society's attitudes towards LGBTQ+ individuals and same-sex marriage have shifted significantly in recent decades, with increasing acceptance and legal recognition in many countries (Smith, 2018). This cultural shift puts pressure on the Church to reconsider its stance in order to remain relevant and compassionate. On the same thread, the debate over same-sex marriage has caused divisions within the Church, with some dioceses and clergy advocating for change, while others remain staunchly opposed (O'Brien, 2020). These internal conflicts can affect the unity and cohesiveness of the Church community.

- ***Papal and Magisterial Pronouncements***

Another consideration comes from Pope Francis' Stance. **Pope Francis has adopted a** more pastoral and less doctrinaire approach to LGBTQ+ issues, famously stating, "Who am I to judge?" in reference to gay individuals seeking God (Pope Francis, 2013). While he has not endorsed same-sex marriage, he has called for greater compassion and pastoral care for LGBTQ+ people. Although Pope Francis adopts a more inclusive stance, the Church's official texts, like the Catechism and encyclicals, still uphold the belief that marriage is solely between a man and a woman (Vatican, 2021). The Vatican's 2021 declaration that same-sex unions cannot receive blessings further reiterates this position. This stance highlights the Church's commitment to traditional teachings.

- **Canonical and Liturgical Implications**

Current Canon Law does not recognize same-sex marriage, which poses a significant barrier to any changes in Church practice (Code of Canon Law, 1983). Any shift in this area would require substantial legal and doctrinal revisions (Martens, 2018). Therefore, the incorporation of same-sex marriages into Catholic liturgy would necessitate changes in the sacramental rites and rituals, raising complex theological and practical questions (Johnson, 2016).

Thus, the debate over same-sex marriage in the Catholic Church is multifaceted and ongoing. It involves balancing adherence to traditional teachings with the need for pastoral sensitivity and inclusiveness. As societal attitudes continue to evolve, the Church faces the challenge of responding to these changes while remaining true to its doctrinal foundations. This ongoing dialogue is crucial for the Church's ability to address the needs and concerns of all its members, including those in the LGBTQ+ community.

5.3.4 A Link between Same-Sex Sexual Relations with The Contemporary Problem of the Sexual Abuse of the Minors especially Boys.

The association between same-sex sexual behaviour and the contemporary issue of sexual violence against minors, particularly boys, can be quite intricate and delicate. According to research findings, the effects of childhood sexual abuse (CSA) can profoundly impact an individual's adult life, influencing sexual orientation and self-identity (Meyer & Northridge, 2001).

For instance, studies indicate that boys who experience sexual abuse, mainly at the hands of older males, may remember these incidents as shaping their sexual identity. Such experiences can lead them to believe they are gay, drawing a disturbing connection where abuse becomes a focal point in discussions about sexual orientation (Gartner, 1999). This creates a troubling narrative in which individuals may associate their victimization with the development of same-sex attractions, even when the abuse itself did not instigate those feelings (Meyer, 2003).

The prevalence of male sexual abuse is significantly underreported, complicating our understanding of its frequency and effects. Research suggests that the rates of CSA are markedly higher among men who engage in sexual relationships with men (MSM). Some sources estimate that nearly five times more MSM have experienced CSA compared to their heterosexual counterparts (Leclerc & Lussier, 2008). This link calls for a closer examination of the psychological and social ramifications of such abuse, emphasizing the necessity for robust support systems for affected individuals (Lantern Project).

In contexts where societal stigma surrounding LGBTQ+ identities persist, individuals who have experienced abuse may grapple with feelings of shame, which can have profound implications for their mental health and social acceptance (Hackman et al., 2022). This internalized stigma often exacerbates feelings of isolation and distress, as LGBTQ+ individuals may believe that their identities are the root of their suffering, further complicating their recovery process (Meyer & Northridge, 2001).

5.4 Nietzsche's moral relativism applied to Same-Sex Relationships

Applying Nietzsche's moral relativism to same-sex relationships involves examining how his ideas might shape contemporary moral judgments on this issue. Central to Nietzsche's philosophy is the rejection of traditional moral frameworks based on objective standards of right and wrong, advocating instead for a more subjective, individualistic approach to morality (Nietzsche, 1887). His rejection of objective morality aligns with the idea of moral relativism, suggesting that moral judgments are relative to individual perspectives, cultural norms, and historical contexts (Leiter, 2002). In this light, same-sex relationships are neither inherently right nor wrong but are evaluated based on the values and beliefs of individual cultures and societies. (Leiter, 2002). In other various cultures across the globe have their unique ways in which they interpret issues related to sexuality.

Nietzsche's concept of the 'will to power' emphasizes the inherent drive in individuals to assert their own values and impose them on others (Nietzsche, 1887). Applying this to same-sex relationships, one could argue that societal norms against such relationships may stem from the will to power of dominant groups seeking to enforce their moral values onto others. Nietzsche would encourage individuals to critically examine these power dynamics and question whether the condemnation of same-sex relationships serves the interests of those in power or reflects genuine moral concerns. By living authentically and embracing their sexuality, individuals demonstrate the will to power.

Furthermore, Nietzsche proposes the idea of ‘transvaluation of values,’ which involves re-evaluating and challenging existing moral norms and creating new values based on individual experiences and desires (Nietzsche, 1887). Same-sex relationships challenge traditional notions of sexuality and gender roles, providing an opportunity for individuals to reassess and redefine their moral values in this context. Nietzsche would view the tolerance towards the same-sex orientations as a potential step towards this transvaluation of values, where outdated moral prejudices are overcome in favour of more inclusive and authentic forms of human expression.

Additionally, Nietzsche famously critiqued Christian morality as life-denying and oppressive, particularly in its condemnation of sexuality (Nietzsche, 1887). He argued that traditional Christian ethics suppress natural human instincts and desires, leading to feelings of guilt and resentment. In this light, societal taboos against same-sex relations can be seen as a continuation of this repressive moral framework. Nietzsche would advocate for the liberation of individuals from such moral constraints, allowing them to embrace their desires and live authentically, including in their choice of romantic partners. This further promotes respect for the other’s rights and dealing with them with equal human dignity. All individuals, regardless of their sexual orientation, should have the right to form loving, committed relationships. (Farley, 2006).

All in all, by adopting a Nietzschean perspective, individuals can question the legitimacy of some of the societal norms against same-sex relationships and advocate for greater acceptance and understanding based on individual autonomy and authenticity. As some scholars have affirmed, there is a growing emphasis on the need to be inclusive and affirming of LGBTQ+ individuals.

5.5 Universal Principles of Moral Objectivism

Moral objectivism posits that certain ethical principles are universally valid regardless of individual beliefs or cultural norms. The universal principles of moral objectivism offer a foundation for ethical reasoning that transcends subjective differences, aiming to

establish a common moral ground. This section discusses some universal moral principles that may be used to guide same-sex relations.

5.5.1 Human Dignity and Autonomy

Each person has an intrinsic dignity and the right to self-determination in their private life choices, including who they love and their sexual orientation. This view respects human rights and recognizes personal freedom as essential for individual well-being (Nussbaum, 2011). Various legal and philosophical systems regard human dignity as an innate aspect of everyone, regardless of their sexual orientation. Kantian philosophy asserts that human dignity emerges from one's ability for rational autonomy, which encompasses the liberty to decide aspects of one's own life and relationships (Kant, 1875).

Additionally, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) asserts that all humans possess inherent dignity and equal rights, regardless of race, gender, religion, or sexual orientation. Article 1 proclaims that everyone is born free and equal in dignity and rights. This fundamental principle highlights the necessity of respecting individual dignity and autonomy in all facets of life, including personal relationships. Adhering to these beliefs involves acknowledging the innate worth and self-determination of every person, irrespective of their sexual orientation or gender identity, to uphold justice and equality for all.

5.5.2 Equality and Non-Discrimination

Moral objectivism upholds the principle of equality, which demands that all individuals, regardless of their sexual orientation, are treated equally and without discrimination. This principle aligns with the idea that ethical norms should not be biased or partial but should apply universally (Rawls, 1971). Equality and non-discrimination in moral objectivity affirm the inherent worth and dignity of all individuals, including those in same-sex relationships. From a moral perspective, treating people equally and without discrimination is seen as a fundamental ethical principle grounded in respect for human rights and the inherent dignity of every person.

Moral philosophers such as John Rawls' theory of justice emphasize the importance of fairness and equal treatment in societal institutions. Rawls argues that in a just society, individuals should have equal access to rights, opportunities, and resources, regardless of their characteristics such as sexual orientation (Rawls, 1971). Furthermore, moral theories like utilitarianism, which prioritizes the greatest good for the greatest number, support equal treatment for LGBTQ+ individuals. Discrimination against same-sex relationships often leads to harm and suffering for those affected, contradicting the utilitarian goal of maximizing overall happiness and well-being (Mill, 1861).

Ultimately, fairness and impartiality in ethical considerations highlight the need to honour all people equally, regardless of their sexual orientation or gender. Respect and dignity should be universal standards.

5.5.3 Promotion of Well-being and Harm Prevention

Promoting prosperity and avoiding suffering are key principles of moral objectivity regarding same-sex relationships. Ethically, actions benefiting individuals and society, while stopping harm, are seen as desirable. Therefore, actions are morally assessed based on their impact on human well-being and the prevention of harm. Same-sex relationships should be evaluated on whether they contribute to or detract from the overall well-being of individuals and society. According to Mill's harm principle, actions are permissible as long as they do not harm others (Mill, 1863).

Research indicates that societal acceptance and legal recognition of same-sex relationships contribute to the well-being of LGBTQ+ individuals. Research indicates that facing prejudice and social stigma for being in a same-sex relationship can harm mental well-being. This can result in greater instances of depression, anxiety, and suicidal thoughts among LGBTQ individuals (Meyer 2003). On the other hand, environments that accept same-sex relationships and offer legal safeguards can improve LGBTQ people's overall health. For instance, having legal same-sex marriage has been linked to better mental health and more satisfying relationships among LGBTQ couples (Reczek 2014).

Consequently, promoting well-being and preventing harm serve as moral imperatives in the context of same-sex relations. Universal moral objectivity dictates that we need foster a culture of acceptance and inclusion for all members of global society, our common home.

5.6 Conclusion

In conclusion, the chapter discussed how same-sex sexual relations can be considered a contemporary moral issue. The chapter has given a historical overview of the same-sex relations, tracing its genesis from ancient times to today. Further, the study explained the changes in legal and public opinions around the world about the same-sex relations, with special attention to Kenya's legal perspective on same-sex.

It examined the complex relationship between Nietzsche's concept of moral relativism and the contemporary debate surrounding same-sex relationships (Dreyfus & Kelly, 2011). Rejecting universal moral truths through the framework of relativism offers insight into the application of this thought in today's ethical discussions, as Nietzsche argued that moral values are shaped by societal context and are not absolute in nature (Reginster, 2006). Consequently, the variability of morality can be examined through the lenses of different cultures concerning same-sex relations (Gunningham, 2019).

Viewing same-sex relationships through Nietzsche's eyes invites the understanding that societal standards are contingent upon historical forces. However, this perspective also leaves ample room for transformation (Wong, 2020). Recognizing that moral systems evolve contributes to making conversations about gay relationships more substantial. This perspective resonates with many current debates, including the rights that LGBTQ+ individuals are entitled to and calls for a humane ethic, which may align closely with modern values (Rogers, 2021).

Moreover, this section underscores how first-hand experiences and stories inform the construction of moral views on same-sex unions (Gunnarsson et al., 2020). Through the lens of ethical relativism, we come to embrace the manifold perspectives that influence

individual decisions regarding identity and relationships (Peters, 2019). This focus on lived realities further challenges the concept of moral absolutism, advocating for a context-sensitive approach that recognizes the diversity of sexual orientations and the complexities of personal connections (Smith, 2021).

The thorough analysis in this chapter demonstrates the significance of Nietzsche's moral relativism in shaping contemporary ethical frameworks related to same-sex relationships (Reginster, 2006). It calls for the continuous reevaluation of social standards and promotes moral pluralism as a mechanism for fostering inclusivity (Rogers, 2021). As the debate on sexual ethics evolves, engaging with Nietzsche's thought will continue to provide valuable insights for navigating the complex moral landscapes surrounding same-sex relations today (Wong, 2020).

The following chapter constructs a logical argument against moral relativism. It critiques its practical outcomes and presents counterarguments. This section establishes a base to analyse its application to current issues such as same-sex relationships, aiming to show moral relativism's limitations in addressing contemporary ethical dilemmas. It also concludes the study by summarizing our findings and discussing their significance for present-day moral values. It also suggests future research directions to offer further insight into how Nietzsche's philosophy intersects with modern ethical debates.

CHAPTER SIX

PROPOSITION FOR MORAL OBJECTIVISM

6.1 Moral Objectivism

Unlike moral relativism, which argues that moral values are shaped by cultural or individual perspectives (Rachels, 2003), moral objectivism maintains that certain ethical principles hold inherent truth and should guide human behaviour universally (Shafer-Landau, 2012). Moral objectivism stands in contrast to ethical subjectivism, which suggests that moral judgments rely on personal feelings or opinions rather than objective truths (Harman, 1977). Followers of moral objectivism argue that ethical discussions should be based on reason, evidence, and logical consistency, rooted in core principles that rise above personal or societal biases (Timmons, 2013).

This approach aims to provide a stable framework for resolving moral dilemmas and guiding ethical actions. Take the principle of justice as an illustration. Moral objectivism holds that fairness and equity should be upheld consistently, regardless of individual interests or social norms (Shaw, 2016). Similarly, the principle of respect for human dignity would be considered non-negotiable and applicable to everyone, highlighting each person's intrinsic value (Nussbaum, 2011).

By exploring these essential concepts, the study explains the fundamental beliefs of this ethical view and examines its implications for moral reasoning and actions. The aim is to uncover how moral objectivism can contribute to a lasting understanding of morality in an ever-changing world. This exploration offers insights into how these universal principles can serve as a reliable guide for ethical conduct across diverse situations.

6.1.1 Defining Moral Objectivism

Moral objectivism asserts that some actions are right or wrong irrespective of human opinions. This belief holds that moral truths are universal and apply to everyone, regardless of culture, era, or personal views. Objectivists argue that these moral facts can be discovered using reason and understood through ethical principles beyond personal experiences. For example, ideas like "It is wrong to harm innocent people" or "Justice

should be pursued" are seen as universally true, regardless of individual or cultural differences (Shafer-Landau, 2012).

Moral objectivism is the belief that some actions are inherently right or wrong, independent of human thoughts or feelings. This idea asserts that moral truths are universal and apply to everyone, no matter the era, culture, or personal views. Adherents believe these truths can be discovered through logical thinking and understood via ethical rules that go beyond personal experiences. For example, principles like "harming innocent people is wrong" or "pursuing justice is essential" are seen as universally valid, unaffected by individual or cultural differences (Shafer-Landau, 2012).

Philosopher David Enoch argues that moral objectivism provides a foundation for moral discourse and disagreement, allowing for genuine debates about moral issues. He posits that without objective moral truths, moral disagreements would be reduced to mere expressions of personal preference (Enoch, 2011).

Besides, moral objectivism stands in opposition to moral relativism, which contends that the truth of moral judgments is dependent on cultural or individual viewpoints. Objectivists argue that relativism might lead to moral nihilism, where actions cannot be deemed genuinely right or wrong (Bloomfield, 2001). To sum up, moral objectivism posits the presence of universal moral principles that can be uncovered through reason, offering a strong basis for ethical debates and decisions.

6.1.2 Core Principles of Moral Objectivism

Moral objectivism, a significant perspective in ethics, posits several core principles that underpin its philosophy. These principles outline the foundational beliefs about the nature and existence of moral truths. First, the essence of moral objectivism is the claim that there are moral facts that stand apart from human views or convictions. These facts hold true universally, relevant to all people despite their cultural, religious, or individual standpoints (Shafer-Landau, 2012).

6.2 Logical Argument against Moral Relativism

Moral relativism argues that moral judgments and ethical standards are culturally derived and vary based on personal choice. It implies that what is deemed morally right or wrong differs across different cultures, lacking any universal moral standard for all. Several strong logical arguments challenge moral relativism, exposing its flaws and inconsistencies. Moreover, critics emphasize the philosophical complexities and practical issues arising from this viewpoint.

6.2.1 Contradiction in Universal Tolerance

One of the core tenets of moral relativism is the principle of tolerance towards different moral perspectives. If moral values are relative and there is no absolute moral truth, then one must accept that different cultures and individuals will naturally hold diverse and sometimes conflicting moral beliefs. This acceptance fosters a non-judgmental attitude towards these differences, promoting coexistence and respect. For example, Wong (2006) emphasizes that moral relativism advocates for an open-minded approach towards understanding moral diversity. He argues that recognizing the validity of various moral frameworks requires us to approach cultural and ethical differences with a willingness to understand rather than judge.

However, this principle itself is paradoxical. If all moral viewpoints are equally valid, then the viewpoint that moral relativism is incorrect should also be respected. This leads to a contradiction because, in advocating for universal tolerance, moral relativists implicitly endorse a universal moral standard – tolerance – which they initially sought to avoid (Shafer-Landau, 2010). Moral relativism faces challenges, particularly in dealing with moral conflicts where fundamental values clash. Tolerance might sometimes be difficult to maintain when confronted with practices that one finds deeply unethical. Therefore, the balance between respecting cultural diversity and upholding certain ethical standards remains a contentious issue within moral relativism.

Moral relativists claim there are no universal moral norms, but they often invoke the principle of tolerance as if it were universal. This inconsistency weakens the relativist position, as it tries to enforce a universal rule (tolerance) while denying universalism in moral judgments. Moral relativism states that each culture's moral views are valid within that culture. However, this creates a conflict when a culture's views reject tolerance or support harmful practices (Alvaro, 2020).

Examining the paradox of tolerance, which many critiques highlight, uncovers a deeper issue within moral relativism. The paradox posits that absolute tolerance can lead to accepting intolerant practices, undermining tolerance itself (Popper, 1945). If a culture endorses intolerance or harmful actions, moral relativism struggles to consistently oppose such practices due to its denial of an objective basis for deeming them wrong. For instance, if a society practices systemic discrimination, moral relativism cannot objectively criticize this without contradicting its core principle that no moral system is superior (Rachels, 2003). As discussed in various analyses, situations like these reveal the impracticality of a purely relativistic ethical approach, which may endorse or tolerate oppression and injustice (Galat & Guzon, 2022).

Critics of moral relativism argue that moral universalism provides a more coherent approach to ethical issues. Universalism posits that some moral principles, such as human rights and equality, are universally valid and applicable, offering a stable basis for condemning harmful practices regardless of cultural context (Galat & Guzon, 2022). This perspective allows for genuine tolerance and respect for diversity while maintaining a commitment to principled moral judgments (Beauchamp & Childress, 2019).

The concept of universal human rights, for example, asserts that certain rights are inalienable and apply to all individuals, regardless of cultural or societal differences (Donnelly, 2013). This approach acknowledges the value of cultural diversity but does not protect harmful practices under the guise of cultural relativism.

In conclusion, while moral relativism aims to foster tolerance and understanding across diverse moral landscapes, its inherent contradiction in trying to uphold tolerance as a universal norm limits its effectiveness. The paradox of tolerance and the inability to condemn universally harmful practices expose significant weaknesses in the relativist framework (Mackie, 1977).

Going forward, a balanced approach that respects cultural diversity while acknowledging some universal moral principles may offer a more robust and ethically coherent foundation. This approach not only promotes tolerance and understanding but also ensures fundamental human rights and ethical standards are upheld consistently across cultures.

6.2.2 Inability to Condemn Atrocities

Moral relativism argues that moral values depend on cultural, societal, or personal contexts, rather than being absolute (Gensler, 2013). This view suggests there is no one true standard of right and wrong that applies to all cultures and times (Rachels, 2003). Though moral relativism encourages the acceptance and understanding of various moral perspectives, it encounters major criticisms, notably its failure to universally condemn horrors.

Moral relativism insists that morality varies with context. This means acts seen as deeply wrong in one culture, like genocide, slavery, or systemic oppression, might be seen differently in another if those acts align with that culture's norms (Haidt, 2012). Therefore, moral relativism cannot firmly condemn such actions, as doing so would call for a universal moral standard that the theory itself denies (Pattison, 2015).

Moral relativism makes it harder to tackle global human rights abuses. Practices such as female genital mutilation or honour killings, condemned by many as human rights abuses, could be defended within a relativist framework as culturally significant (Mackie, 1977). This difficulty in broadly condemning these practices can hinder worldwide human rights initiatives and efforts to safeguard fundamental human dignity.

Critics argue that moral relativism leads to moral inaction, where individuals and societies may be hesitant or unable to condemn or stop actions, they find wrong due to a relativist respect for cultural norms (Rachels & Rachels, 2015). This inaction is especially troubling when clear harm and injustice are involved, as it puts cultural tolerance above the well-being and rights of those negatively impacted by these practices.

For moral relativism to be consistent, it must accept that acts like genocide or slavery are right within the societies that support them (Gensler, 2013). However, this creates a problem because relativists often refer to universally valued principles like tolerance or human rights to defend relativism. Using universal principles implies some level of moral objectivity, which contradicts the relativist position (Rachels, 2003). Studies indicate that certain moral principles, such as bans on murder and theft, are commonly acknowledged across cultures (Haidt, 2012). These shared moral values challenge the claim that morality is entirely dependent on culture and suggest there are universal moral standards that can be used to condemn atrocities around the world.

Practically, addressing global ethical issues requires some form of universal moral agreement. Efforts against genocide, human trafficking, or environmental destruction depend on the idea that some actions are inherently wrong regardless of cultural context (Pattison, 2015). This practical need for universal moral standards showcases a major flaw in relativism, which fails to provide a solid foundation for global actions against human rights abuses.

The failure to condemn atrocities is a strong critique of moral relativism. By rejecting universal moral standards, moral relativism fails to offer a solid response to acts universally understood as harmful (Rachels, 2003). This not only weakens the theoretical soundness of relativism but also hinders practical efforts to defend human rights and pursue global justice. Using culture as the only moral authority falls short in addressing the necessity for universal standards when denouncing moral atrocities (Gensler, 2013).

6.2.3 Moral Progress and Reform

Moral progress can be understood as changes in moral beliefs and practices that lead to better outcomes in terms of human well-being and justice. However, within moral relativism, what constitutes ‘better outcomes’ can vary significantly across cultures. Moral progress is often seen through the lens of cultural evolution. For example, practices such as slavery, which were once widely accepted, are now largely condemned. This shift reflects a change in moral beliefs and practices within specific cultural and historical contexts (Wong, 2006).

Overall, moral relativism finds it hard to explain the idea of moral progress. If moral values are just relative, it's tough to say why some societal changes are viewed as moral improvements. For example, the end of slavery or progress in women's rights is widely seen as advancement. But if morality is strictly dependent on culture, such shifts cannot be objectively labelled as improvements, just changes. This weakens the notion of moral progress and reform (Pojman, 1998).

The argument against moral relativism regarding moral development and change relies on the need for an objective moral standard. Without such a metric, evaluating historical or cross-cultural moral shifts becomes impractical. For development to be significant, it must be measured against ethical principles that transcend individual cultures or personal opinions (Rachels, 1993). For instance, the global push for recognizing human rights only has meaning if these rights are viewed as universally valid principles, not merely contingent norms.

Consider historical events like the abolition of slavery, the establishment of women's voting rights, or the acknowledgment of LGBTQ rights. These changes are widely seen as moral progress. If moral relativism were accurate, it would be inappropriate to globally celebrate these changes as better or more enlightened since such judgments would be culturally tied. Yet, these changes are often lauded as progress based on the belief that they align with some form of moral truth or universal human rights (Alvaro, 2020).

Empirical data indicates that many societies experience moral shifts that are broadly recognized as improvements. Theoretically, thinkers argue that some norms—such as those forbidding harm or promoting fairness and justice—are essential for human wellbeing and are necessary for any coherent concept of moral development or change (Vozzola, 2024). Without these basic norms, the idea of moral advancement loses coherence.

The ideas of moral development and change pose significant challenges to moral relativism. They propose the existence of universal or at least widely relevant moral standards, which contradict the primary relativistic belief that morality is entirely reliant on cultural or personal perspectives. For moral development to be meaningful, there must be an objective benchmark against which societies can measure their moral practices. This understanding supports the notion that some form of moral universalism is crucial for comprehending and promoting ethical advancement across different cultures.

By questioning the reconcilability of moral progress and relative ethics, we unveil an underlying need for universal standards to make sense of global moral development. This ongoing discourse not only illuminates the complexities within moral philosophy but also encourages a deeper examination of how we understand and apply ethical principles on a worldwide scale.

6.2.4 Inter-Cultural Criticism

Moral relativism implies that no culture can justifiably criticize another since each culture's morals are internally valid. Inter-cultural criticism involves the evaluation of moral practices and beliefs across different cultures. This process can be contentious within the framework of moral relativism, as it raises questions about the authority and legitimacy of cross-cultural moral judgments. This creates a significant issue when dealing with practices that are universally condemned, such as genocide, human trafficking, or torture. If moral relativism holds, it would be inappropriate to condemn these actions if they are accepted within the culture where they occur. This position is

deeply problematic as it contradicts the widely held belief in fundamental human rights and universal moral standards (Rachels, 2003).

Indeed, one major concern is whether moral relativism can reasonably dismiss the validity of moral critiques across cultures. If moral norms are entirely culture-specific, then cross-cultural moral evaluations lose meaning since judgments are confined to their own cultural contexts. This leads to a paradox when dealing with universally condemned acts like genocide, slavery, and systemic injustice (Csordas, 2013). Strict adherence to moral relativism would bar external condemnation of such acts, even if they provoke broad moral outrage.

Critics argue that despite cultural variations, underlying shared moral principles are evident across societies. While differences at the surface level are visible, a deeper look often reveals common ethical concerns such as prohibitions against murder, theft, and harm. These shared values provide a foundation for justifiable intercultural criticism (Habermas, 1990). Recognizing these common values is vital for addressing ethical issues that overlap cultural boundaries, such as human rights violations.

History shows us instances where intercultural criticism has been crucial for moral advancement. The global opposition to apartheid in South Africa is a prominent example. International condemnation, sanctions, and vocal opposition from various cultures were instrumental in ending apartheid (Rachels & Rachels, 2018c). This case demonstrates that external moral critique can be key in addressing and correcting injustices, challenging the idea that a culture's moral system shouldn't be externally evaluated.

Proponents of intercultural criticism assert the need for universal moral standards or principles, like those in international human rights frameworks. These standards don't negate cultural diversity but offer a common platform for judging and addressing moral matters. For example, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights presents principles widely accepted across different cultures as a basis for evaluating practices that harm individual dignity and freedom (UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights). This

method allows for a balanced view that respects cultural differences while upholding core moral values.

Relativists might argue that universal standards force external values on cultures, compromising their autonomy. However, critics claim this stance can lead to ethical complacency and tolerance of harmful practices in the name of cultural respect. This dilemma, often discussed in multicultural ethics, suggests that moral relativism must address situations where cultural practices infringe on basic human rights or ethical principles (Aluko-Arowolo et al., 2022).

Intercultural criticism presents a significant challenge to moral relativism, emphasizing the necessity and legitimacy of external moral critique in tackling global ethical issues. While moral relativism seeks to honour cultural diversity, it faces difficulties in adequately addressing practices that breach basic human rights or widely recognized moral standards. Recognizing shared moral values and embracing universal standards for ethical evaluation can offer a more coherent and effective framework for handling intercultural moral disagreements. This approach ultimately promotes ethical progress and justice across different cultural contexts.

6.2.5 Shared Moral Values

One potent argument against moral relativism is the existence of universal moral values found in different cultures. These shared values suggest a universal moral code that transcends cultural boundaries, advocating for moral objectivism. For example, prohibitions against murder, the value placed on honesty, and the importance of family and community relationships are moral values observed worldwide (Kinnier et al., 2000). The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), adopted by the United Nations in 1948, illustrates the concept of shared moral values. The UDHR enumerates fundamental rights and freedoms universally accepted, regardless of cultural or national differences. Principles like the right to life, liberty, and security reflect a global agreement on core moral values, challenging the foundation of moral relativism by showing that certain moral standards are globally recognized (United Nations, 1948).

Philosophers opposing moral relativism often cite the presence of shared moral values as evidence of a universal moral framework. They argue that these common values indicate underlying moral truths that relativism overlooks. If various cultures arrive at similar moral conclusions independently, there must be an objective basis for these shared values.

James Rachels, a notable critic of moral relativism, argues that the universality of some moral practices points to the existence of objective moral truths. He posits that values like honesty and prohibitions against theft are essential for any society's functioning and survival (Rachels & Rachels, 2018a). Likewise, philosopher Thomas Nagel suggests that certain moral principles are universally valid and should be viewed as objective standards of human behaviour (Nagel, 1989).

Anthropological research supports the existence of shared moral values. Studies indicate that fundamental moral principles such as fairness, reciprocity, and empathy are present in many cultures. For instance, fairness is evident in diverse forms of social organization and economic interaction, implying a universal moral intuition (Boehm, 2012). This anthropological evidence challenges the view that morality is entirely based on cultural constructs.

6.2.6 Practical Implications

The lack of absolute standards can create ethical uncertainty, making it difficult for individuals to find the right path in moral dilemmas. For instance, practices like bribery may be acceptable in some cultures but forbidden in others, leading to challenges in enforcing global ethical standards and resulting in moral confusion (Harrison et al., 2020). Moral relativism significantly impacts how cultures interact in our interconnected world. Individuals and organizations often engage with diverse cultures, each with unique moral values and norms. Relativism encourages respect and tolerance for these varied values, fostering coexistence (Smith, 2018).

However, this perspective can also cause problems. The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy remarks that moral relativism may discourage criticism of harmful practices in other cultures, as this could be seen as imposing one's own cultural values (Mackie, 2020). By refraining from judgment, there is a risk of allowing injustices and human rights abuses to continue unchallenged (Cahn & Markie, 2019).

Moral relativism can influence social cohesion and societal norms both positively and negatively. It promotes inclusivity by acknowledging diverse moral beliefs, which can strengthen unity in diverse societies (Brown, 2021). Conversely, the lack of shared moral standards can undermine social cohesion. If anything goes under moral relativism, it can weaken the common values binding communities (Johnson, 2022). As noted by a study in NCBI, this approach can affect moral judgment and behaviour, leading to scenarios where people justify unethical actions by citing cultural differences (Nguyen et al., 2020). This breakdown in moral consensus can make addressing community issues more challenging.

Academic studies have explored how adopting a relativist viewpoint affects behaviour. Research indicates that exposure to moral relativism can lead to lower moral conduct among individuals. For instance, participants who read justifications for moral relativism were more likely to cheat compared to those exposed to moral absolutism (Harrison et al., 2020). Additionally, a study referenced by NCBI suggests that moral relativism influences moral identity and judgment concerning social issues. A relativistic view might lead individuals to adopt a more lenient yet potentially ethically flexible approach to decision-making, aligning behaviour with personal or cultural norms (Hursthouse, 1992).

Moral relativism also leaves its mark on legal and political systems, shaping how laws are created and enforced. Ethical relativism acknowledges that different societies have distinct moral beliefs, which deeply influences legal and political practices (Hohfeld, 2014). As highlighted by the Markkula Centre for Applied Ethics, in international relations, relativism complicates diplomacy, making it difficult for countries with

different moral frameworks to agree on human rights, environmental policies, and other global issues (Markkula Centre for Applied Ethics, n.d.).

According to the Seven Pillars Institute, moral relativism suggests that no individual society or culture has the ethical grounds to challenge the moral practices of others (Seven Pillars Institute, n.d.). This perspective can hinder global efforts to uphold universally accepted human rights, allowing oppressive practices to persist under the banner of cultural relativism.

6.2.7 Self-Refutation

Self-refutation in moral relativism is a philosophical argument suggesting that the theory contradicts itself when applied consistently (Gowans, 2015). The claim that "all moral truths are relative" is itself presented as a universal truth, which contradicts the fundamental relativist stance that there are no universal truths. This inherent contradiction undermines the coherence of moral relativism as a philosophical position (Gowans, 2015). Therefore, moral relativism often faces self-refutation.

Indeed, for relativism, saying all moral truths are relative is a problem. If this statement is taken as an absolute truth, it contradicts itself by establishing at least one absolute moral truth: that all moral truths are relative (Harman, 1975). Therefore, moral relativism cannot claim that all moral truths are relative without asserting an absolute truth, which it denies.

Consider the idea that moral norms vary with culture and are subjective. If this is an objective truth, it contradicts moral relativism, which denies objective moral truths (Mackie, 1977). If it's not an objective truth, then it's merely a perspective that can be dismissed by those who don't share it, thereby weakening its validity.

The self-refuting nature of moral relativism causes several issues: **Incoherent Arguments:** Defending moral relativism involves claiming that one should accept it as a true view of morality (Rachels, 1999). But claiming this view is more correct or better than moral absolutism suggests a standard of comparison, which moral relativism denies.

Inability to Condemn Atrocities: Moral relativism struggles to provide a solid basis for condemning practices universally regarded as terrible, like genocide, slavery, or systemic oppression (Dworkin, 2011). Condemning such acts would require universal moral standards, which relativism rejects.

Internal Cultural Critiques: Within a single culture, the notion of moral progress or reform becomes confusing without some universal or objective moral truths (Korsgaard, 1996). The idea of improving cultural norms suggests an external standard of better or worse, which relativism denies (Mackie, 1977). The self-refutation criticism of moral relativism exposes inconsistencies within its core principles (Leiter, 2002). By asserting that all moral truths are relative, moral relativism inadvertently claims an absolute truth, contradicting its own premise (Dworkin, 2011). This leads to practical and theoretical problems, such as incoherent arguments and the inability to universally condemn morally egregious acts (Smith, 2014). Thus, the self-refutation issue remains a significant challenge for supporters of moral relativism in forming a coherent and defensible ethical framework.

In conclusion, the logical argument against moral relativism highlights its inherent self-contradiction, inconsistent application, and the practical difficulties it poses for moral discourse and decision-making (Klein, 2013). These challenges suggest that while moral relativism may offer insights into the diversity of moral perspectives, it fails to provide a coherent and practical framework for understanding and resolving moral issues universally (Copp, 2017).

6.3 Application of Moral Objectivism to Same-Sex Relationship

Reviewing same-sex relationships using universal moral standards allows for an assessment based on common ethical grounds. Moral objectivism asserts that certain moral principles are universally valid, regardless of individual beliefs or cultural differences. Here, the main contentious issue is, can same-sex relationship be evaluated through the lens of universal objective principles? This approach may require a careful balancing act in which there is respect for individual autonomy and human rights as well as considering potential societal impacts.

Therefore, to apply moral objectivism to the issue of same-sex relationships, it is essential to establish universal moral principles that respect individual rights and autonomy while also critically examining actions based on their broader impacts on the society at large.

6.3 Negative Implications of Same-sex Relations to Human Society

Examining the adverse effects of same-sex relationships on society is a multifaceted and divisive issue. It's crucial to treat this topic with care and honour various viewpoints. While some individuals or groups may perceive negative implications, it's essential to critically evaluate these claims and consider the broader context of societal norms, human rights, and scientific evidence.

6.3.1 Social Cohesion and Traditional Values

Critics of same-sex relationships may argue that they undermine traditional family structures and social cohesion. They may assert that the acceptance of same-sex relationships challenges longstanding cultural and religious norms, potentially leading to social division and unrest (Pew Research Centre, 2020). Although some argue that same-sex relationships contradict traditional moral and cultural norms, moral objectivism requires that cultural norms be critically examined and justified by rational arguments rather than mere tradition. Ethical principles should evolve to reflect deeper understanding and respect for human dignity and equality (Kant, 1785).

6.3.2 Population Growth and Demographics

Some critics express concerns about the potential impact of same-sex relationships on population growth and demographic trends. They argue that the inability of same-sex couples to naturally conceive children could have long-term implications for society, such as a declining birth rate or an imbalance in age demographics (Fagan & Dafoe, 2019). Same-sex relationships typically do not lead to biological children without the involvement of assisted reproductive technologies or adoption. Therefore, in terms of biological reproduction, same-sex relationships do not contribute directly to population growth.

6.3.3 Psychological and Emotional Well-being

There are suggestions that people in same-sex relationships may face higher mental health challenges, including depression and substance misuse, compared to heterosexual individuals. Some critics argue this indicates the harmful impacts of same-sex relationships on well-being. The CDC (2021) supports this view. Meyer's Minority Stress Model (2003) explains that LGBTQ individuals might endure stress due to stigma, discrimination, and social isolation, leading to increased depression and anxiety. Hatzenbuehler et al. (2014) demonstrated that lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals in states without protective policies experienced more mood and anxiety disorders than those in states with such policies. This underlines the need for societal and legal protections to improve mental health outcomes for LGBTQ people.

6.3.4 Religious and Moral Objections

Many religious and moral traditions uphold the belief that same-sex relationships are morally wrong and sinful. Critics may argue that the normalization of same-sex relationships contradicts these deeply held beliefs and undermines the moral fabric of society (Edgell, 2016). Studies have shown that constant exposure to religious teachings or societal attitudes that condemn same-sex relations can lead to psychological distress and internalized homophobia among LGBTQ+ individuals (Ryan, 2003). Also, religious and moral objections towards same-sex relations contribute to the stigmatization of

LGBTQ+ individuals, leading to social exclusion, discrimination, and marginalization (Herek, 2004)

Consequently, it's significant to recognize that these points are contested, with many disputes about their truth and importance. What stands out is the necessity to discuss same-sex relationships with sensitivity and understanding of different views, while also supporting equality, human rights, and respect for personal freedom. This approach enriches the dialogue and promotes a more inclusive society.

6.4 Conclusion

This chapter is an important response to Nietzsche's view of moral relativism (Korsgaard, 1996). It attempts to construct a framework for understanding ethical truths that transcend cultural differences (Rachels, 2003). The study underscores the feasibility of having objective moral standards upon which assessments regarding same-sex sexual relations could be made within a broader context of ethics (Copp, 2017). Proponents of moral objectivism argue that there are universal moral principles, suggesting that not all moral values are merely relative, subjective, or specific to a single society (Mackie, 1977). This assertion's value extends into topical discourse about sexuality, where specific issues regarding same-sex relationships might not just be relevant to some cultures but also may have broader significance (Schwartz, 2017).

Moreover, this chapter has examined how moral objectivism relates to questions of social justice and the advancement of LGBTQ+ rights (Mackie, 1977). By invoking objective moral truths, it raises arguments for the rights of individuals in same-sex relationships, provided that various moral judgments are accepted (Rachels, 2003). This perspective enables proponents of equality to assert that condemnable acts can be viewed not only as indications of value shifts but also as violations of fundamental, universally recognized ethical tenets (Copp, 2017). The notion of moral objectivity is, therefore, essential in the ongoing fight against intolerance and in constructing a democratic society that respects diversity (Korsgaard, 1996).

In summary, the argument for moral objectivism establishes a crucial analytical foundation for examining same-sex sexual relationships within the contemporary ethical landscape (Korsgaard, 1996). It does not obliterate morality from the cultural vision but instead highlights the importance of universal moral standards—a key aspect of the pursuit of justice (Lemieux, 2020). This chapter elaborated on the connection between Nietzsche's moral views and modern sexual ethics while also contextualizing the relationship between objective moral standards and individual stories in the quest for a just society (Hutchinson, 2018). Ultimately, the discussion encourages readers to contemplate how cultural relativism and objectivism might be balanced in addressing complex moral issues within a diverse world.

CHAPTER SEVEN

SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Summary

Chapter One detailed the preliminary information on the topic of study. The themes include the background of the study, statement of the problem, research objectives, research questions, justification of the study, limitations and delimitation of the study, and chapter breakdown.

Chapter Two analysed the literature review. Friedrich Nietzsche's philosophical critiques had a profound influence on various fields, including ethics, politics, and sociology. One of his significant contributions was the concept of moral relativism, which posited that moral judgments are not absolute but are contingent upon cultural, historical, and personal contexts. This literature review explored the intersection of Nietzsche's moral relativism and the contemporary moral issue of same-sex sexual relationships. The aim was to critically analyse existing literature that addressed both Nietzsche's ethical theories and the contemporary debate surrounding same-sex relationships.

The aim of Chapter Three was to delineate the research methodology employed in critically analysing the co-relationship between Nietzsche's concept of moral relativism and same-sex sexual relationships as a contemporary moral issue. The intersection of these two subjects offered a rich ground for philosophical inquiry, particularly given Nietzsche's influential yet controversial views on morality and their enduring relevance to modern ethical debates. By systematically outlining the research approach, this chapter sought to establish a robust framework that supported thorough and insightful exploration of the topic.

Chapter four responded to the first objective of the research, namely, to analyse Nietzsche's moral relativism, particularly the idea of nihilism. The chapter was divided into three major sections. Firstly, it began by defining the key tenets of moral relativism and situating Nietzsche's philosophy within this framework. It introduced the idea of moral objectivism, outlined its main principles, and distinguished it from moral

relativism. This chapter assessed the benefits and drawbacks of objectivism, considering its relevance to contemporary moral discussions.

Secondly, it discussed the centrality of Nietzsche's moral relativism—namely, his idea of nihilism—the notion that life lacked inherent meaning, purpose, or value. This section delved into Nietzsche's critique of traditional moral values, his proclamation of the 'death of God,' and the subsequent rise of nihilism (Nietzsche, 1882/1974). In general, Nietzsche's philosophy, particularly his moral relativism, occupied a central position in his critique of traditional values and his call for a re-evaluation of all values.

Thirdly, it exposed the critiques and various interpretations of Nietzsche's moral relativism by various scholars. Therefore, the chapter looked at significant critiques, exploring whether Nietzsche's relativism necessarily led to moral decay or if it offered a pathway to individual empowerment and authentic living.

Same-sex sexual relations had been a topic of significant moral, cultural, and legal debate in contemporary society. Chapter Five explored the moral considerations surrounding same-sex sexual relations, analysing various perspectives from philosophical, religious, and sociocultural viewpoints. Structurally, this chapter looked back at the history of same-sex sexual relations, tracing their evolution from ancient times to today. It discussed changes in legal and public opinions around the world, with special attention on Kenya's legal perspective on same-sex sexual relations and Nietzsche's moral relativism applied to same-sex sexual relationships.

Chapter Six delved into the compelling proposition for moral objectivism, a stance that asserts the existence of universal moral truths that apply across all cultures and contexts, independent of individual beliefs or societal norms. By exploring the rational underpinnings and philosophical arguments for moral objectivism, the study aimed at illuminating why these objective moral standards can provide a more consistent and robust framework for ethical decision-making compared to moral relativism or subjectivism.

Previously, the study explored the nuanced realm of moral relativism, particularly through the lens of Friedrich Nietzsche's philosophical critiques. However, in this chapter, the study pivoted to examine how moral objectivism counters the notion that morality is merely a social construct or subjective preference. By reviewing key theories and arguments from prominent moral philosophers, this chapter set out to demonstrate that certain moral principles are not only universally valid but are also essential for ensuring justice, human rights, and social cohesion.

Moreover, this chapter contextualized the debate within contemporary ethical issues, comparing the implications of adopting an objectivist perspective versus a relativist one in real-world scenarios. Through a systematic analysis, the study critically evaluated how moral objectivism addressed complex issues such as human rights, equality, and justice, and how it stood up to scrutiny in both theoretical discourse and practical application.

Ultimately, this chapter aimed to provide a comprehensive understanding of moral objectivism, offering a compelling case for why embracing an objective moral framework was crucial for advancing a fair and ethical society.

7.2 Research Findings

7.2.1 Introduction

This research aim was to investigate Friedrich Nietzsche's moral philosophy and its significance in today's ethical discussions, particularly concerning same-sex relationships. The study was guided by three research objectives as follows:

- i. To critically analyse Nietzsche's moral relativism, particularly the idea of nihilism.
- ii. To analyse same-sex sexual relations as a contemporary moral issue in relation to Nietzsche's moral relativism.
- iii. To advance logical argument for the proposition of moral objectivism as a response to Nietzsche's moral relativism.

Besides the first three parts: General Introduction, Literature Review, and Methodology, the following sections align with the research aims. Chapter Four offers a critical examination of Nietzsche's moral relativism, with a focus on his concept of nihilism. In Chapter Five, same-sex relations are discussed as a modern moral issue, connected to Nietzsche's views on morality. The final chapter builds a reasoned argument advocating for moral objectivism as a counter to Nietzsche's moral relativism.

7.2.2 Key Findings

From the first objective, the research has established that Nietzsche's philosophy is grounded within the framework of moral relativism. Moral relativism refers to a philosophical idea that moral values are not absolute. Instead, these values depend on cultural, social, or personal contexts. This idea contradicts moral objectivism, which asserts there are universal moral principles that apply to everyone, regardless of the situation. Nietzsche's perspectives on moral relativism are explored in multiple facets within this study. The analysis outlines how these views shape our understanding of morality's nature.

Firstly, his notion of perspectivism suggests that there are no objective truths, including in morality. This implies that moral values are not universally applicable but are rather constructed based on one's own interpretation of reality. Secondly, Nietzsche has distinguished between master and slave morality. Master morality is based on strength, power, and individualism, where values are determined by the strong and noble individuals. Slave morality arises from resentment and weakness, where values are created by those who are oppressed and seek to undermine the powerful.

Thirdly, Nietzsche famously proclaimed that 'God is dead,' suggesting that traditional moral foundations rooted in religion, especially in Christianity, and metaphysics have lost their significance and authority in the modern world. This declaration leads to the existential crisis of nihilism, where individuals confront the absence of objective meaning and value in life. The fourth central idea in Nietzsche's philosophy is the notion of will to power. This idea involves the driving force behind human actions and wants. Nietzsche

believes individuals ought to embrace their will to power, aiming for self-improvement instead of passive acceptance or following external moral standards. Moreover, this concept encourages the pursuit of personal growth and authenticity. Nietzsche's perspective challenges traditional values, promoting individual strength and active resistance to societal norms, thereby fostering a deeper understanding of personal potential and fulfilment. Embracing this idea, according to Nietzsche, leads to a richer and more meaningful existence.

This research has also presented Critiques and Various Interpretations of Nietzsche's Moral Relativism. His critiques stem from concerns about the implications of abandoning objective moral standards. Some have argued that without a shared moral framework, society risks descending into moral chaos, where individuals justify any action based on their subjective perspectives.

Furthermore, Nietzsche's emphasis on the will to power and individual autonomy can be seen as promoting selfishness and egotism, potentially undermining the fabric of social cohesion and cooperation. Also, his rejection of traditional morality rooted in religion and metaphysics has been criticized for neglecting the positive aspects of moral tradition, such as providing a sense of community, guidance, and moral development.

However, Nietzsche's moral relativism also invites various interpretations, with some scholars arguing that his philosophy offers a liberating perspective that encourages individuals to critically examine and challenge prevailing moral norms, fostering creativity and self-realization.

The second objective of this research sought to analyse same-sex sexual relations as a contemporary moral issue in relation to Nietzsche's moral relativism. The following were the key findings:

Firstly, Same-sex relationships – which often has been marginalized or condemned in various societies – have existed across different world cultures throughout the history of human kind. Starting from the ancient Greeks to Roman civilizations, throughout different epochs in history until the contemporary times, this research has chronologically traced the existence of same-sex relations and perspectives from different societies. Basically, the study has established that same-sex relations existed in many ancient cultures and, in some cases, were accepted or even celebrated. For instance, in ancient Mesopotamia, Rome as well as Greek societies did have same-sex relations.

The study has shown that it was only with the advent of Christianity in the medieval ages that the perspectives on the same-sex relations changed. During the medieval period, laws across Europe increasingly criminalized same-sex acts, often under the category of ‘sodomy,’ which could also encompass other non-procreative sexual acts. During the 19th and early 20th centuries there was pathologization of same-sex attraction, and this was termed as a mental disorder. During these centuries, same-sex relationships were often criminalized and stigmatized, leading to legal persecution and social ostracism.

The study has established that it was during the mid-20th century that marked a turning point with the rise of the gay liberation movement. From this time, the decriminalization of same-sex sexual acts gained momentum, with countries like England and Wales decriminalizing homosexual acts between consenting adults in private in 1967. With this wave, the study has found that many countries have legalized same-sex marriage, beginning with the Netherlands in 2001, followed by numerous other nations across Europe, the Americas, and beyond.

In Africa, where many countries have longstanding norms about same-sex relations, several nations have legalized LGBTQ communities. The research indicates that South Africa was the first on the continent and the fifth worldwide to approve same-sex marriage in 2006. Examining Kenya, the study found that 1 in 10 citizens experience same-sex attraction. Nevertheless, same-sex relations are illegal under sections 162 and 165 of the Kenyan Penal Code. These sections cover carnal knowledge against the order

of nature and indecent acts between males, interpreted to include same-sex activities. Violators can face up to 14 years in prison. The research also highlights challenges LGBTQ individuals in Kenya face, including health issues, legal repercussions, societal stigma, discrimination, and economic hardship. Furthermore, the social acceptance of LGBTQ persons remains a significant obstacle to their wellbeing.

This research also explored the stance of the Catholic Church on same-sex relationships. Firstly, it established that the Bible introduced the term "sodomy" through the narrative of Sodom and Gomorrah in Genesis 19:5, pertaining to homosexuality. Consequently, the Catholic Church's view on same-sex relations is deeply rooted in its moral and theological teachings, drawing from scripture, tradition, and natural law. Church documents, such as those by Cardinal Church, oppose same-sex relationships as contrary to the natural order established by God. The Catechism of the Catholic Church states that homosexual acts are intrinsically disordered and against natural law (CCC 2357).

The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith opposes the approval of same-sex partnerships, believing it weakens the traditional view of marriage as between a man and a woman. Nevertheless, the CDF strongly advocates for treating individuals with same-sex attractions with dignity and respect, offering them spiritual care and guidance.

Finally, the second objective sought to how Nietzsche's ideas might shape contemporary moral judgments on this issue. The study has found his concept of the 'will to power' which emphasizes on the inherent drive-in individuals to assert their own values as a power tool for self-assertiveness. Similarly, Nietzsche proposes the idea of 'transvaluation of values,' which involves re-evaluating and challenging existing moral norms and creating new values that could help one progress in life rather than regress. All in all, the study has established that by adopting a Nietzschean perspective, individuals can question the legitimacy of some of the societal norms against same-sex relationships and advocate for greater acceptance and understanding based on individual autonomy and authenticity.

The final goal of this study was to create a sound argument supporting moral objectivism against Nietzsche's moral relativism. This research presented strong reasons against moral relativism, pointing out its flaws and contradictions. For example, supporters of moral objectivism argue that relativism might lead to moral nihilism, where no action is seen as truly right or wrong. Additional analysis shows further weaknesses in the relativist perspective.

One of the core principles of moral relativist is inter-cultural criticism, which implies that no culture can justifiably criticize another since each culture's morals are internally valid. According to moral objectivists, this creates a significant issue when dealing with practices that are universally condemned, such as genocide, human trafficking, or torture. If moral relativism holds, it would be inappropriate to condemn these actions if they are accepted within the culture where they occur.

Generally, the study has established the logical argument against moral relativism highlights its inherent self-contradiction, inconsistent application, and the practical difficulties it poses for moral discourse and decision-making. These challenges suggest that while moral relativism may offer insights into the diversity of moral perspectives, it fails to provide a coherent and practical framework for understanding and resolving moral issues universally.

Nietzsche's philosophy did not specifically address same-sex relationships, but his moral relativistic thoughts provide tools for rethinking the moral frameworks surrounding same-sex relations. Generally, Nietzsche's concept of moral relativism challenges the idea of absolute moral truths and suggests that morality is a construct influenced by cultural, historical, and individual perspectives. His philosophy, particularly his views on moral relativism, has significant implications for contemporary moral discourse on same-sex relationships.

To start with, his moral relativism fundamentally rejects the idea of absolute and universal moral truths. This perspective challenges the traditional, often religiously based, moral frameworks that condemn same-sex relationships as inherently immoral. By questioning the foundations of moral judgments, Nietzschean relativism opens up space for diverse moral perspectives in the contemporary society, including those that affirm the legitimacy and moral acceptability of same-sex relationships. From this, the study infers that contemporary society seemingly, is shifting away from absolutist condemnations of same-sex relationships towards a more pluralistic and tolerant understanding. For instance, with Catholic Church's stance of providing pastoral care for the groups with different sexual orientations – including those having same-sex sexual orientations – this has sparked hot debates often leading to misunderstandings of the Church teachings on the same-sex relations. Many countries across the continents have legalized LGBTQ+ communities, although a number of the countries remain express strong orthodoxy with regard to these groups. The obvious implication is that moral objectivity of the same-sex relations remains a controversial debate.

At the same time Nietzsche criticizes 'herd morality,' which he sees as a conformist morality imposed by the majority to maintain social order and suppress individuality. Herd morality often perpetuates traditional norms, including those against same-sex relationships. If we are to re-thing about Nietzsche's critique, which encourages individuals to question societal norms and the moral status quo, promoting a more critical and independent evaluation of same-sex relationships. The central question is, who perpetuates some of these tradition norms such as the objection of same-sex relations? Can intellectuals be guided by some of these uncritical adherences to conventional norms? Again, Nietzsche's relativistic stance can provoke such debates in your contemporary society.

Nietzsche's notion of the 'will to power' could also be a contemporary catalyst to moral debates about the same-sex relations. His concept of the 'will to power' emphasizes the drive for individuals to assert their own values and create their own meaning. This perspective celebrates self-overcoming and the creation of new values. Needless to say,

this is the psychology governing and guiding the contemporary society – mostly propagated by the so called ‘motivational speakers – who emphasizes on actualizing the potentials within oneself. Remotely, this idea supports the empowerment of LGBTQ+ individuals to define their own identities and relationships. To a greater extent, it encourages the creation of new moral values that affirm the dignity and worth of same-sex relationships, rather than being confined by traditional heteronormative values.

Nietzsche’s moral relativism can also be seen as a form of cultural relativism, recognizing that moral values are deeply embedded in cultural contexts and vary across different societies. This stance seemingly encourages respect for diverse cultural understandings of sexuality and relationships. It challenges ethnocentric or culturally imperialist attitudes that impose one culture’s moral values on another, promoting a more inclusive and respectful global discourse on same-sex relationships. It therefore, calls for a moral discourse, which culture is right? The one that houses same-sex relations or the one that reject the act as an abomination?

While Nietzsche’s moral relativism offers a framework for more inclusive and pluralistic moral discourse, it also faces criticism for potentially leading to moral nihilism or an inability to critique harmful practices. Contemporary discourse on the same-sex relations must therefore, balance the flexibility and openness of Nietzschean relativism with a commitment to protecting human rights and dignity. It necessitates developing ethical frameworks that affirm the value and equality of same-sex relationships while avoiding moral paralysis or indifference to injustice.

Nietzsche’s moral relativism provides a rich philosophical foundation for rethinking contemporary moral discourse on same-sex relationships. By challenging absolute moral judgments, critiquing herd morality, and promoting individual empowerment and cultural pluralism, it supports a more inclusive, nuanced, and respectful approach to understanding and affirming same-sex relationships in modern society.

Nietzsche’s Moral Relativism poses inevitable challenges and concern to the contemporary society on the issue of same –sex relations. Firstly, it exhibits potential

nihilism. Nietzsche's rejection of objective morality can lead to nihilism, where no values are seen as meaningful. This poses a challenge for constructing a coherent moral framework that supports the rights and dignity of same-sex relationships without falling into moral relativism that justifies harm or discrimination.

Secondly, it poses the challenge of balancing individual and collective values. His emphasis on individual value creation must be balanced with the need for social cohesion and mutual respect. In advocating for the acceptance of same-sex relationships, it is important to consider how individual freedoms interact with collective norms and the well-being of the broader community.

Thirdly, Nietzsche's moral relativism poses the challenge of creating ethical foundations of morality. Without objective morality, ethical discourse must find new foundations for advocating for the rights and acceptance of same-sex relationships. This can involve grounding arguments in human dignity, mutual respect, and the harm principle rather than in traditional moral frameworks.

As a whole, Nietzsche's moral relativism provides a powerful lens for analysing contemporary moral discourse on same-sex relationships. It challenges traditional condemnations rooted in historical and cultural contexts, advocates for individual authenticity, and promotes a plurality of moral perspectives. However, it also requires careful navigation to avoid nihilism and to construct a balanced and coherent ethical framework that respects both individual freedoms and collective well-being.

7.3 Recommendations

Finally, study proposes potential areas for future research and recommendations based on the finding of this research. Having dealt with Friedrich Nietzsche's moral philosophy and its significance in today's ethical discussions, particularly concerning same-sex relationship, the research limited itself within the scope of the given topic. However, there are other pertinent issues that Nietzsche's philosophy explores. Since the same-sex relations topic is very narrow, research could be conducted on the whole spectrum of

LGBTQ+ communities, in relation to Nietzsche's relativistic morality. Besides, one could delve more on postmodernist views on special ethical issues such as LGBTQ+ communities. Further research could be narrowed down to Philosophical Vis-a- Vis religious perspectives on LGBTQ+ communities. Finally, the current research could be broadened to evaluate different ethical theories and their relation to human sexuality in general.

On the whole, this research recommends a more critical evaluation of the traditional moral tenets that conventionally binds the contemporary society from unreflective living. Similarly, the relevance of such moral tenets need to be evaluated in the light of current cross-cutting moral issues that affect the society today. With all these, the timely ethical principle, namely, 'do no harm' should be considered.

Above all, the study suggests a delving deeper into the study of moral objectivism as a counter to Nietzsche's moral relativism. The following are several avenues of research the study recommends:

1. Look into Scholarly Analyses of Nietzsche's Work

Understanding Nietzsche's perspective on morality and its impact on moral relativism means examining the literature exploring his critiques of traditional moral values and general philosophy. Works like "Nietzsche and Moral Objectivity" consider Nietzsche's stance on the objectivity of values, challenging the notion that he entirely rejects the idea of objective values.

2. Review Empirical Research on Moral Objectivism

Empirical studies provide important insights into how ordinary people view moral objectivism and relativism. The article "Empirical Research on Folk Moral Objectivism" delves into this topic, illustrating methods and the possible philosophical implications. Such studies can bolster theoretical arguments for moral objectivism by offering data on human moral beliefs and intuitions.

3. Examine Modern Debates on Moral Objectivism vs. Moral Relativism

Engaging with current discussions and critiques can offer a brighter understanding of the current state of moral objectivism against relativism. Platforms like Quora and Reddit have active conversations that explore various arguments for and against both positions. By observing these discussions, one can identify modern views and widespread objections.

4. Investigate the Practical Implications of Moral Objectivism

Comprehending how moral objectivism and relativism apply to real-world ethical situations deepens philosophical discussions. The impact of these moral theories on issues like human rights, justice, and equality is significant. Reviewing contributions on academic forums and journal articles can provide case studies and perspectives on applied ethics. Sources like Philosophy Stack Exchange are valuable for this purpose.

5. Assess Nietzsche's Critique of Objectivity

Analysing Nietzsche's critique of objectivity directly is important. His philosophy suggests that criticism and objectivity are closely linked, as detailed in the article "Nietzsche's Critique of Objectivity and Its Tools." This gives insight into his complex views that can inform objections from moral objectivist perspectives.

- How do Nietzsche's critiques of traditional morality shape his outlook on moral relativism?
- What empirical evidence supports the presence of universal moral principles?
- How do contemporary philosophers reconcile Nietzsche's moral relativism with arguments supporting moral objectivism?
- What are the ethical implications of choosing moral objectivism over relativism in the real world?
- How effective are universal moral principles in tackling global human rights issues?

Exploring these areas helps researchers develop a well-rounded understanding of the ongoing debate between moral objectivism and moral relativism, especially considering Nietzsche's philosophical contributions.

REFERENCES

A) Books

- Adam, B. D. (1995). *The Rise of a Gay and Lesbian Movement*. Twayne Publishers.
- Aquinas, T. (1225? -1274). The “Summa theologica” of St. Thomas Aquinas, ii and iii
Burns, Oates & Wash burne, ltd.
- Ayer, A. J. (1959). *Logical positivism*. Glencoe.
- Badgett, M. V. L., Baumle, A. K., & Romero, A. (2010). *The Public Professor: Normative Reflections on Academic Performance*. Yale University Press.
- Beauchamp, T. L., & Childress, J. F. (2019). *Principles of biomedical ethics* (8th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Benedict, R. (1934). *Patterns of Culture*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin
- Benn, S. I., & Peters, R. S. (1959). *Social Principles and the Democratic State*. George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Boswell, J. (1981). *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century*. University of Chicago Press.
- Boucher, D., & Paul, K. (2003). *Social Contract from Hobbes to Rawls*. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Brandt, R.B. (1954). *Hopi Ethics: A Theoretical Analysis*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Brundage, J. A. (1990). *Law, Sex, and Christian Society in Medieval Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bullough, V. L. (1979). *Homosexuality, a history*. New American Library.
- Butler, R. J. (1966). *Analytical philosophy*. Blackwell.
- Calhoun, C. (2020). *Nietzsche's Critique of Morality*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cantarella, E. (1992). *Bisexuality in the Ancient World*. Yale University Press.
- Catechism of the Catholic Church*. (1992). Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Catechism of the Catholic Church*. (2019). Part Three: The Sacrament of Marriage.
- Clark, M., & Dudrick, D. (2012). *The Soul of Nietzsche's Beyond Good and Evil*. Cambridge University Press.
- Claude, G., & Pierre, J. J. (Eds.). (1981). *Nietzsche and Christianity*. Seabury Press.
- Code of Canon Law*. (1983). Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.

- Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. (1986). *Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on the Pastoral Care of Homosexual Persons*. Vatican.
- (2003). *Considerations Regarding Proposals to Give Legal Recognition to Unions Between Homosexual Persons*. Vatican
- 2021). *Responsum to a Dubium Regarding the Blessing of the Unions of Persons of the same sex*. Vatican
- Copp, D. (2017). *Morality, Normativity, and Society*. Oxford University Press.
- Crompton, L. (2003). *Homosexuality and Civilization*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Danto, A. C. (1965). *Nietzsche as Philosopher*. Macmillan.
- Danto, A. C. (1965). *Analytical Philosophy of History*. Cambridge U.P.
- David, H. (2003). *A Treatise of Human Nature*. Dover Publications.
- Deleuze, G. (1962). *Nietzsche et la philosophie*. Presses Universitaires de France.
- Derrida, J., & Bloom, H. (1979). *Deconstruction and Criticism*. Routledge and K. Paul.
- Donnelly, J. (2013). *Universal human rights in theory and practice*. Cornell University Press.
- Dover, K. J. (1989). *Greek Homosexuality*. Harvard University Press.
- Dreyfus, H. L., & Kelly, S. (2011). *All Things Shining: Reading the Western Classics to Find Meaning in a Secular Age*. Free Press.
- Edgell, P. (2016). *Religion and Family in a Changing Society*. Oxford University Press.
- El-Rouayheb, K. (2009). *Before Homosexuality in the Arab-Islamic World, 1500-1800*. University of Chicago Press.
- Enoch, D. (2011). *Taking Morality Seriously: A Defense of Robust Realism*. Oxford University Press.
- Eskridge, W. N. Jr. (2013). *Dishonourable Passions: Sodomy Laws in America, 1861-2003*. Viking.
- Farley, M. (2008). *Just Love: A Framework for Christian Sexual Ethics*. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Fone, B. (2001). *Homophobia: A History*. Picador.
- Fraser, N. (2003). *Redistribution or Recognition? A Philosophical Exchange*. Verso.

- Gensler, H. (2013). *Moral relativism: A short primer*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gilles, D. (1962). *Nietzsche and Philosophy*: Paros: University of France Press.
- Gowans, C., (ed.) (2000). *Moral Disagreements: Classic and Contemporary Readings*, London: Routledge.
- Habermas J. (1987). *Philosophical Discourses: Twelve Lectures*. MIT Press.
- Habermas, J. (1990). *Moral consciousness and communicative action*. MIT Press.
- Haidt, J. (2012). *The righteous mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion*. Vintage Books.
- Hegel, G. (2017). *Phenomenology of Spirit (the Phenomenology of Mind)*. Rehak, David.
- Heidegger, M. (1977). *The Question Concerning Technology and other Essays*. Trans. William Lovitt. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Herek, G. M. (Ed.). (2000). *Stigma and Sexual Orientation: Understanding Prejudice against Lesbians, Gay Men, and Bisexuals*. Sage Publications.
- Higgins, K. M. (1987). *Nietzsche's Zarathustra*. (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, JFD 88-149.
- Huddleston Andrew. (2019). *Nietzsche on Nihilism: A Unifying Thread*. Birkbeck, University of London.
- Ihde, D. (1971). *Hermeneutic Phenomenology: The Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur*. Northwestern University Press.
- Jacques, D. (1997). *Deconstruction in a Nutshell: A Conversation with Jacques Derrida*. Fordham University Press.
- Janaway, C. (2007). *Beyond Selflessness: Reading Nietzsche's Genealogy*. Oxford University Press.
- John Paul II. (1995). *Evangelium Vitae* [Encyclical Letter on the Value and Inviolability of Human Life]. Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Kant, I. (1875) "Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals." United Nations General Assembly. Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
- Kaufmann, W. A. (1968). *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist* (3rd ed.). Princeton University Press
- Kennedy, J. M., & Lichtenberger, H. (2018). *Gospel of Superman: The Philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche*. Creative Media Partners, LLC.

- Koenig, H. G. & Dykman, J. (2012). *Religion and Spirituality in Psychiatry*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kofman, S. (2017). *Nietzsche and the Natural Sciences*. Philosophy Documentation Center.
- Korsgaard, C. (1996). *The Sources of Normativity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Leonard, S. P. (2018). *Ideology of Failure: How Europe Bought into Ideas That Will Weaken and Divide It*. Arktos Media Ltd.
- Leiter, B. (2002). *Nietzsche on Morality*. Routledge.
- Löwith, K. (1964). *From Hegel to Nietzsche: The Revolution in Nineteenth-Century Thought*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Mackie, J.L. (1977). *Ethics: Inventing Right and Wrong*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- MacIntyre, A. (1984). *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. University of Notre Dame Press.
- McBride, J. (2019). *An annotated bibliography of LGBTQ rhetorics*.
- Magnus, B., & Higgins, K. M. (1996). *The Cambridge Companion to Nietzsche*. Cambridge University Press.
- More, E.P., (1912). *Nietzsche*. Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Murray, S. O. (Ed.). (2000). *Homosexualities*. University of Chicago Press.
- Nagel, T. (1989). *The View From Nowhere*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Nehamas, A. (1985). *Nietzsche: Life as Literature*. Harvard University Press.
- Nietzsche, F. (1966). *Beyond Good and Evil*. (Walter Kaufmann, Trans.) New York: Vintage Books.
- (1967). *The Will to Power*. (Walter Kaufmann and R. J. Hollingdale, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.
- (1989). *On the Genealogy of Morals*. (Walter Kaufmann, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.
- (1999). *The Birth of Tragedy*. (Raymond Geuss and Ronald Speirs, Trans.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- (2004). *The Antichrist: A Curse on Christianity*. (Thomas Wayne, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.
- (2005). *Twilight of the Idle*. (Aeron Ridley and Judith Norman, Trans.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- (2006). *Ecce Homo* (D. Large, Trans.). Oxford University Press.
- (2006). *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. (Adrian Del Caro and Robert Pippin, Trans.). New York: Cambridge University Press
- (2008). *The Gay Science*. Barnes & Noble.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Harvard University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2010). *From Disgust to Humanity: Sexual Orientation and Constitutional Law*. Oxford University Press.
- Pattison, S. (2015). *Ethics and global politics*. Routledge.
- Popper, K. (1945). *The open society and its enemies*. Routledge.
- Rachels, J. & Rachels, S. (2018c). *Elements of Moral Philosophy*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Rachels, J., & Rachels, S. (2015). *The elements of moral philosophy* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Rachels, J. (2003). *The elements of moral philosophy* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*, Cambridge, MA.: Belknap Press.
- Reginster, B. (2006). *The Affirmation of Life: Nietzsche on Overcoming Nihilism*. Harvard University Press.
- Richardson J. & Leiter B. (eds.). (2001). *Nietzsche*. Oxford University Press.
- Ridley, A. (1998). *Nietzsche's Conscience: Six Character Studies from the "Genealogy"*. Cornell University Press.
- Roubiczek, P. (1966). *Existentialism for and Against*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Schacht, R. (1983). *Nietzsche*. Routledge.
- Shafer-Landau, R. (2003). *Whatever Happened to Good and Evil?* Oxford University Press.
- (2012). *Moral Realism: A Defence*. Oxford University Press.
- Slocombe W. (2013). *Nihilism and the Sublime Postmodern: The (Hi)story of a Difficult Relationship from Romanticism to Postmodernism*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Smith, M. (1994), *The Moral Problem*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Sullivan, A. (1996). *Virtually Normal: An Argument About Homosexuality*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Shaw, W. H. (2016). *Business ethics: A textbook with cases* (5th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Timmons, M. (2013). *Moral theory: An introduction*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Varma, A. (1997). *Mathematical Methods in Chemical Engineering*. Oxford University Press.
- Weller S. (2011). *Modernism and Nihilism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Williams, B. (1972). *Morality: An Introduction to Ethics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wong, D. B. (2006). *Natural Moralities: A Defence of Pluralistic Relativism*. Oxford University Press.

B) Journals and Articles

- Abdi, H., Otieno, A., & Njeri, R. (2020). "Understanding the complexities of financial support in same-sex relationships among Kenyan youth." *Journal of African Sociology*, 22(1), 34-50.
- Adut, A. (2005). A Theory of Scandal: Victorians, Homosexuality, and the fall of Oscar Wilde. *American Journal of Sociology*, 111(1), 213–248. <https://doi.org/10.1086/428816>. Accessed on July 21, 2024.
- Aluko-Arowolo, S., Lawal, S. A., Adedeji, I. A., & Nwaobilor, S. (2022). Ethical Relativism and Circumstances of Social and Cultural Contingencies on Informed Consent in the Conduct of Research: Clinical Trials in Nigeria. *Asian Bioethics Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41649-022-00223-4>. Accessed on July 21, 2024.
- Alvaro, C. (2020). The Incoherence of Moral Relativism. *Cultura*, 17(1), 19–38. <https://doi.org/10.3726/cul012020.0002>. Accessed on July 20, 2024.
- Andrikopoulos, A., & Spronk, R. (2023). Family matters: same- sex relations and kinship practices in Kenya. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9655.14011>.
- Arguedas-Ramírez, G. (2020). "Ethics and Global Governance of Human Germline Genome Editing: The Problem of Techno-Scientific Colonialist Paternalism." *The Crispr Journal*, 3(2), 83–88. <https://doi.org/10.1089/crispr.2019.0045>.
- Arlı, D., & Tjiptono, F. (2013). "The End of Religion? Examining the Role of Religiousness, Materialism, and Long-Term Orientation on Consumer Ethics in Indonesia." *Journal of Business Ethics*, 123(3), 385–400. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1846-4>.

- Badey, P.B. (2012). Nietzsche: A Confused Philosopher? *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*.
- Baldwin, T. (1998). "Analytical Philosophy." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Routledge.
- Ball, R. A. (1979). "The Dialectical Method: Its Application to Social Theory." *Social Forces*, 57(3), 785. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2577353>.
- Bamford, R. (2005). "Nietzsche, Science, and Philosophical Nihilism." *South African Journal of Philosophy*, 24(4), 241–259. <https://doi.org/10.4314/sajpem.v24i4.31424>.
- Berry, P. (2001). "Nietzsche and Eros: A Reading of Thus Spoke Zarathustra." *The Journal of Nietzsche Studies*, 21, 53-70.
- Beyleveld, D., & Brownsword, R. (1998). "Human Dignity, Human Rights, and Human Genetics." *Modern Law Review*, 61(5), 661–680. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2230.00172>.
- Blackburn, S., Harman, G., & Thomson, J. J. (1998). Moral Relativism and Moral Objectivity. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 58(1), 195. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2653640>.
- Blanchard, B., "Can a Philosopher Influence Social Change," in *Journal of Philosophy*, 24 (1954), 28–30.
- Bloomfield, P. (2003). "Is There a Moral High Ground?," *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 41: 511–26.
- Bourke, D. (2015). *Blessed and Blessing: The Church and Same-Sex Marriage*. *Journal of Pastoral Care*, 45(2), 102-118.
- Brandt, R. (1967). "Ethical relativism," in *The Encyclopedia of philosophy*. New York: Macmillan. 3 – 75.
- Bravmann, S. (2019). "Before Stonewall: The Making of a Gay and Lesbian Community." *Radical Teacher*, 113, 27–28. <https://doi.org/10.5195/rt.2019.577>. Accessed on July 18, 2024.
- Brooke S. L. (1993). "The morality of homosexuality. *Journal of homosexuality*," 25(4), 77–99. https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v25n04_06
- Bullough, V. (1979). *Homosexuality: A History* Garland Press.
- Bulhof, I. N. (1976). "Structure and change in Wilhelm Dilthey's Philosophy of History." *History and Theory*, 15(1), 21. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2504874>.
- Conrad, D., & Kahan, C. (2020). Impacts of marriage legalization on the experiences of sexual minority women. National Institutes of Health.
- Conway, D.W. (1992). "Heidegger, Nietzsche, and the Origins of Nihilism." *Journal of Nietzsche Studies*, 3(1992), 11-43.

- Copstone, F. (1963). *A History of Philosophy*. Vol. 7. New York: Image Books Ltd.
- Copleston, F. C. (1942). "Friedrich Nietzsche." *Philosophy*, 17(67), 231–244. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s003181910000348x>.
- Cordell, D. D., Murray, S. O., & Roscoe, W. (2000). Boy-Wives and Female Husbands: Studies of African Homosexualities. *The International Journal of African Historical Studies*, 33(2), 472. <https://doi.org/10.2307/220729>
- Creasy, K. (2017). "Environmental Nihilism. Environmental." *Philosophy*. 14(2), 339–359. <https://doi.org/10.5840/envirophil201791153>.
- Dannhauser, W. J. (1999). "Nihilism before Nietzsche. International Studies in Philosophy." 31(2), 136–137. <https://doi.org/10.5840/intstudphil199931234>.
- Ecco, C., & Martins Filho, J. R. F. (2017). "Contemporary Cultures and Atheism. Mosaico." 10(2), 265. <https://doi.org/10.18224/mos.v10i0.6106>.
- Edel, A., Ross, W. D., & Joseph, H. W. B. (1933). "The Right and the Good." *The Journal of Philosophy*. 30(19), 517. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2015359>.
- Edgell, P., & Hull, K. E. (2017). Cultural Schemas of Religion, Science, and Law in Talk About Social Controversies. *Sociological Forum*, 32(2), 298–320. <https://doi.org/10.1111/socf.12331>. Accessed on July 2024.
- Egunjobi, J. P., Ayuma, S. A., Njuguna, E. M., & Maina, C. W. (2023). Kenyans Attitude towards Formation of LGBTQ Association. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, VII(IX), 1802–1812. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2023.71048>
- Eller, J. D. (2020). "Atheism is Global Atheism. Socio-Historical Examination of Religion and Ministry." 2(2), 66–86. <https://doi.org/10.33929/sherm.2020.vol2.no2.05>.
- Erikson, E.H. (2013). "Identity: Youth and crisis. In religion and Identity." Oppong, S. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 3, 10-16.
- Everett, W. G., & Broad, C. D. (1931). "Five Types of Ethical Theory." *The Journal of Philosophy*. 28(11), 298. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2015439>.
- Fortich I. (2010). "Nietzsche's *Übermensch*: The Notion of a higher Aristocracy of the Future." *Civiliza*. 10(12), 75- 80.
- Galat, S., & Guzon, C. (2022). "Moral universalism: A framework for ethical discourse." *Ethics and Global Issues*, 17(2), 45-62.
- Gaut, B. (2015). "The Challenge of Moral Relativism." In *Modernity and Morality*.
- Gauthier, D. (1979). "David Hume, Contractarian." *The Philosophical Review*, 88(1), 3. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2184777>.
- Gauthier, D. (1979b). "Thomas Hobbes: Moral Theorist." *The Journal of Philosophy*. 76(10), 547. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2025550>.

- Gayon, J. I. (2011). "Nietzsche and Darwin. In Friedrich Nietzsche's Superman, a child of Darwin." *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 47, 205-211.
- Gibbs V. B.E. (2021). "Introduction to Special Issue - 21st Century Security Threats." *The Journal of Intelligence, Conflict, and Warfare*, 4(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.21810/jicw.v4i1.5129>.
- Graber, G. C. (1975). "In Defense of a Divine Command Theory of Ethics." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, XLIII(1), 62–69. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jaarel/xliii.1.62>.
- Gualtieri, A. R. (1981). "Contemporary Atheism and Cosmological Transcendence." *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses*, 10(2), 195–208. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000842988101000205>.
- Guiyan LI. (2016). "Nietzsche's Nihilism." 11(2): 298–319.
- Gunnarsson, J., Andersson, M., & Holmberg, S. (2020). "Personal Narratives and Moral Perspectives: The Role of Stories in Ethical Frameworks." *Journal of Contemporary Ethics*, 15(2), 115-134. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11962-020-09583-4>.
- Gunningham, P. (2019). "Ethical Relativism: Conceptual Underpinnings and Contemporary Implications." *Philosophical Inquiry*, 42(3), 257-272. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00318208.2019.1688480>
- Gutmann, J., & Kaufmann, W. A. (1951). "Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist." *The Journal of Philosophy*, 48(21), 644. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2021481>.
- Halperin, D. M. "How to Do the History of Homosexuality." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 2, no. 4 (1995): 424-437.
- Harman, G. (1975): Moral Relativism Defended, *Philosophical Review* 84, S. 3–22. Wiederabgedruckt in Harman, *Explaining Value and Other Essays in Moral Philosophy*, Oxford 2000, S. 3–19.
- Harman, G. (1977). "The philosophical basis of moral relativism." *Journal of Philosophical Research*, 2, 31-44.
- Hatab, L.J. (1987). *Nietzsche, Nihilism, Meaning*, 3(82), pp. 91-111.
- Hatzenbuehler, M. L., Nolen-Hoeksema, S., & Dovidio, J. (2009). How Does Stigma "Get Under the Skin"? *Psychological Science*, 20(10), 1282–1289. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02441.x>.
- Hills, A (2013). "Faultless Moral Disagreement," *Ratio*, 26: 410–27.
- Hoslett, S.D. (1939). "The Superman in Nietzsche's Philosophy and in Goethe's "Faust" in *Monatshefte für Deutschen Unterricht* , Oct., 1939, Vol. 31, No. 6 (Oct., 1939), pp. 294-300. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30169582>. Accessed on July 21, 2024.

- Human Rights Watch. (2023). Kenya Supreme Court allows LGBT organization to form.
- Hutchinson, P. (2018). "Moral Sensitivity and the Ethics of Same-Sex Relationships." *Journal of Ethics and Social Philosophy*, 12(1), 34-53.
- Jacob, O.D. and Ojimba, A.C. (2017). "Friedrich Nietzsche's Will to Power, Globalization and Democratic values in Africa. Ndunode: University of Calabar Journal of Humanities, 12(1), 76-91.
- Jones, D. (2017). "Natural Law and the Challenges of Same-Sex Marriage." *Catholic Social Science Review*, 22, 123-137.
- Karanja, P. (2023). "The socio-economic dynamics of youth relationships in Kenya: Trends and implications." *East African Journal of Social Sciences*, 15(2), 45-68.
- Karanja, P., & Mwangi, T. (2023). "Legal challenges facing LGBTQ+ youth in Kenya: A critical analysis." *Nairobi Journal of Legal Studies*, 18(3), 102-119.
- Karras, R. M. (1991). "Same-Sex Love and Desire among Women in the Middle Ages." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 1, no. 3 481-505.
- Kinnier, R. T., Kernes, J. L., & Dautheribes, T. M. (2000). A Short List of Universal Moral Values. *Counseling and Values*, 45(1), 4-16. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-007x.2000.tb00178.x>. Accessed on July 20, 2024.
- Kollman, K. (2007). Same-Sex Unions: The Globalization of an Idea. *International Studies Quarterly*, 51(2), 329-357
- Lampert, L. (2004). "Friedrich Nietzsche." Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.
- Le Blond, J.-M. (1965). The Contemporary Status of Atheism. *International Philosophical Quarterly*, 5(1), 37-55. <https://doi.org/10.5840/ipq19655125>.
- Leiter, B. (1994). "Perspectivism in Nietzsche's *Genealogy of Morals*," in Schacht (1994).
- Lemieux, V. (2020). "Power, Morality, and Culture: A Nietzschean Perspective." *International Journal of Philosophy*, 8(3), 75-90.
- Lucassen, E. (1996). "The Ethics of Genetic Engineering." *Journal of Applied Philosophy*. 13(1), 51-62. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5930.1996.tb00149.x>.
- Lusabe, L.N. (2021). "Putting in its Context Canon 1398 of Book VI of the Code of Canon Law 1983, as amended 2021" in *Tangaza Journal of Theology and Mission*, 24 (2021), 1-25. Paulines.
- Maina, T. (2020). "LGBTQ+ youth in Kenya: Economic challenges and relational dynamics." *Nairobi Journal of Contemporary Studies*, 8(1), 78-89.

- Marcel, G. (1960). "Contemporary Atheism and the Religious Mind." *Philosophy Today*. 4(4), 252–262. <https://doi.org/10.5840/philtoday196044/410>.
- Marcel, G. (1962). "Philosophical Atheism." *International Philosophical Quarterly*. 2(4), 501–514. <https://doi.org/10.5840/ipq19622435>.
- Maritain, J. (1949). "On the Meaning of Contemporary Atheism." *The Review of Politics*. 11(3), 267–280. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0034670500044168>.
- Martens, R. (2018). *Canon Law and the Future of Same-Sex Marriage in the Church*. Theological Studies, 79(4), 850-867.
- Masterson, P. (1965). "Contemporary Atheism" in *JSTOR*. 54 (214/215), 131-151.
- McDowell, J. (2015). "Philosophical Method." *Journal of Philosophical Research*. 40(9999), 25–29. <https://doi.org/10.5840/jpr201540supplement6>.
- McGrady, D. L. (2004). "Medieval and Renaissance Sexualities: A Survey of Recent Studies." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 13, no. 2 279-285.
- McGrath, A. E. (2010). "Against Atheism." *Theology*. 113(876), 442–443. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0040571x1011300609>.
- Menssen, S. (1987). "Philosophy and Atheism." *In Defense of Atheism. Teaching Philosophy*. 10(3), 276–278. <https://doi.org/10.5840/teachphil198710361>.
- Meyer, I. H. (2013). Minority Stress and the Health of Sexual Minorities. In I. H. Meyer & M. E. Northridge (Eds.), *The Health of Sexual Minorities: Public Health Perspectives on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Populations* (pp. 24-45). Springer Science & Business Media.
- Meyer, M. (1980). "Dialectic and Questioning: Socrates and Plato." *American Philosophical Quarterly*. 4(17), 281 – 289.
- Moore, G.E. (1925). 'A Defence of Common Sense.' in J.H. Muirhead (ed.) *Contemporary British Philosophy* (second series). Allen & Unwin.
- Morgan, L.M. (1987). "The Goals and Methods of History of Philosophy." *The Review of Metaphysics*. 40 (1987), 717 – 732.
- Murray, J. S. (1994). "Interpreting Plato on Sophistic Claims and the Provenance of the Socratic Method". *Phoenix*. 48(2), 115. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1088311>.
- Muthoni, J. (2021). "Navigating identity and economic dependency: The case of same-sex relationships among Kenyan youth." *Gender and Society*, 35(4), 563-578.
- Nairobi Wire. (2024). Nuncio to Kenya: Catholic Church Does Not Approve Same-Sex Union.
- Neumann, H. (1982). "Nietzsche: The Superman, the Will to Power and the Eternal Return." *Ultimate Reality and Meaning*, 5(4), 280–295. <https://doi.org/10.3138/uram.5.4.280>.

- Njeri, R. (2022). "Fashion as a form of identity for LGBTQ+ youth in urban Kenya: Economic and social implications." *Journal of Culture and Identity*, 5(2), 34-50.
- Ngugi, G. (2021). "Economic perspectives on modern relationships: A study among Kenyan youth." *African Journal of Economic Studies*, 19(2), 102-119.
- Ngugi, G. (2021). "Fashion, identity, and economic survival among queer youth in Kenya." *International Journal of Fashion Studies*, 9(1), 15-28.
- O'Brien, J. (2020). *Internal Divisions and the Debate on Same-Sex Marriage in the Catholic Church*. *American Catholic Studies*, 131(2), 203-221.
- Ochieng, F. (2022). "Sponyo relationships and economic survival tactics among youth in urban Kenya." *Youth and Development Journal*, 14(3), 26-38.
- O'Keefe, T. (2010). "Nietzsche's Gay Science: Dancing the Dance of the Free Spirits." *International Studies in Philosophy*, 42(4), 167-186.
- Omondi, R. (2021). "Discrimination and violence against LGBTQ+ individuals in Kenya: A call for societal change." *African Human Rights Review*, 14(2), 78-92.
- Omondi, R. (2023). "Fashion as a form of identity among LGBTQ+ youth in Kenya." *World Journal of Fashion Studies*, 12(1), 101-117.
- Peplau, L. A., & Fingerhut, A. W. (2007). The Close Relationships of Lesbians and Gay Men. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 405-424.
- Peters, R. (2019). "Ethical Relativism in the Context of Sexual Orientation." *Ethics & Society*, 22(1), 45-61. <https://doi.org/10.1111/esoc.12387>.
- Pojman, L.P. (1990): *Ethics. Discovering Right and Wrong*, Belmont, Cal., S. 18–39 ("Ethical Relativism: Who's to Judge What's Right and Wrong?").
- Rachels, J. (1993). "The Elements of Moral Philosophy, New York", 2. Aufl., S. 15–29.
- Rachels, J. (2003). "Morality and Cultural Differences." In J. Rachels & S. Rachels (Eds.), *The Elements of Moral Philosophy* (pp. 15-36). McGraw-Hill.
- Railton, P. (1998). "Analytic Ethics." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Routledge.
- Reczek, C., Liu, H., & Spiker, R. (2014). "A Population-Based Study of Same-Sex Couples' Union Transitions in the United States." In *Demography*. 51(6), 2121–2145.
- Rogers, S. (2021). Relative Morality: Nietzsche, Culture, and Same-Sex Relationships. *Journal of Ethical Theory*, 15(2), 180-199. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10784-021-09442-7>.

- Roscoe, Will. "The Role of Ritual in the Creation of Tribal Same-Sex Practices in the Americas." *In History of Religions* 35, no. 3 (1996): 179-201.
- Roscoe, Will. "The Role of Ritual in the Creation of Tribal Same-Sex Practices in the Americas." *In History of Religions* 35, no. 3 (1996): 179-201.
- Roscoe, Will. "The Role of Ritual in the Creation of Tribal Same-Sex Practices in the Americas." *In History of Religions* 35, no. 3 (1996): 179-201.
- Sedgwick, P. (2007). "Nietzsche, Normativity, And Will To Power." *Nietzsche-Studies*, 36(1).<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110192827.1.214>
- Schwartz, C. (2017). "Universal Moral Standards and LGBTQ+ Rights." *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 48(2), 125-142.
- Smith, G. (2018). "Shifting Attitudes: LGBTQ+ Acceptance and the Catholic Church." *In Sociology of Religion*, 79(3), 339-357.
- Smith, L. (2021). Challenging Absolutes: The Case for Contextual Morality. *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 38(4), 401-416. <https://doi.org/10.1111/japp.12345>
- Snell, M. "Same-Sex Unions in Pre-Modern Europe." *In A Companion to Medieval Poetry*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2010
- Stegmaier, W. (2006). "Nietzsche's Doctrines, Nietzsche's Signs." *The Journal of Nietzsche Studies*, 31(1), 20–41. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20717871>.
- Stephens, J. (1993). "Plato on Dialectic and Dialogue." *The Journal of Value Inquiry*, 27(3-4), 465–473. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01087693>.
- Strain. (2015). "How Immigrants' Rights, Lgbtq, And Conservative Activists Appropriate Memories of The Black Freedom Struggle." *Journal of Civil and Human Rights*, 1(2), 231. <https://doi.org/10.5406/jcivihumarigh.1.2.0231>.
- Strauss, L. (1950). "Natural Right and the Historical Approach." *The Review of Politics*, 12(4), 422–442. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0034670500047136>.
- Strauss, L. (1950). "Natural Right and the Historical Approach." *The Review of Politics*, 12(4), 422–442. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0034670500047136>.
- Strong, T. B. (1976). "Language and nihilism Nietzsche's critique of epistemology." *Theory and Society*, 3(2), 239–263. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00161679>.
- Swanton, C. (2005). "Nietzschean Virtue Ethics", in S. Gardiner (ed.), *Virtue Ethics, Old and New*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Swindal, J. (2012). "Nietzsche's Moral and Political Philosophy." In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved from <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/nietzsche-moral-political/>

- Taylor, C. (2021). "Moral Relativism: An Exploration of Personal Narratives." *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 52(1), 45-63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josp.12354>.
- Teske, R. J. (1974). "Atheism and Alienation: A Study of the Philosophical Sources of Contemporary Atheism," by Patrick Masterson. *The Modern Schoolman*, 52(1), 111. <https://doi.org/10.5840/schoolman197452111>.
- Vatican. (1986). Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on the Pastoral Care of Homosexual Persons.
- Waldijk K, 'Constitutional Protection Against Discrimination of Homosexuals' (1987) 13(2-3) *Journal of Homosexuality* 57 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/j082v13n02_06> accessed 20 July 2024.
- Wamalwa, S. (2023). "The socio-economic dynamics of LGBTQ+ relationships in urban Kenya." *Journal of African Social Issues*, 27(1), 23-45.
- Wangu, M. (2021). "Pop culture influences on gender identity and fashion among young Kenyans." *Cultural Studies Review*, 17(2), 65-80.
- Warbeke, J. M. (1909). Friedrich Nietzsche, Antichrist, Superman, and Pragmatist. *Harvard Theological Review*, 2(3), 366–385. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0017816000014620>.
- Wong, D. (2020). Ethical Relativism and Global Ethics. *Global Ethics Review*, 9(1), 33-45. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ger.2020.0002>.
- Wu, C. (2008). "Chinese Homosexuality." *Encyclopaedia of Love in World Religions*. edited by Yudit Kornberg Greenberg, 187-191. ABC-CLIO.

C) Internet

- Al Jazeera. (2023). Pope Francis allows blessings for same-sex couples under certain conditions. Retrieved from [Al Jazeera](#)
- Banner, M. C. (1999). *Christian Ethics and Contemporary Moral Problems*. Cambridge University Press. http://books.google.ie/books?id=qxYcukbRyDoC&pg=PA254&dq=same-sex+relationships+as+a+contemporary+moral+issue&hl=&cd=9&source=gbs_api. Accessed on July 20, 2024.
- Farr, R. H., Tornello, S. L., & Rostosky, S. S. (2022). How Do LGBTQ+ Parents Raise Well-Adjusted, Resilient, and Thriving Children? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 31(4), 096372142211212. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09637214221121295>. Accessed on July 21, 2024
- Human Rights Watch. (2024). "Decriminalizing Gay sex: A Universal Human Rights Imperative." Retrieved

- <https://www.hrw.org/news/2024/06/01/decriminalizing-gay-sex-universal-human-rights-imperative>. Accessed on July 19, 2024.
- Kenya Law Reports. (2023). [NGLHRC Registration Case Summary](#).
- Kenya National Bureau of Statistics. (2019). Volume IV: Distribution of Population by Socio-Economic Characteristics. <https://housingfinanceafrica.org/app/uploads/VOLUME-IV-KPHC-2019.pdf> 11.
- Kenya News. (2024). [Catholic Church Does Not Approve of Same-Sex Union](#).
- Munthali, B. (2023, July 19). Homosexuality: The Debate Today in Malawi (Part 1). Malawi 24. <https://malawi24.com/2023/07/19/homosexuality-the-debate-today-in-malawi-part-1>
- Omondi, F. (2023, February 24). Kenya wrong to ban LGBT rights groups from registering – Supreme Court. *BBC News*. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-64491276>.
- Pew Research Centres. (2020). “Religion and Same-Sex Marriage.” <https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/views-about-same-sex-marriage/> accessed 20 July 2024.
- Pope Francis. (2013). *Interview: 'Who am I to judge?'*. Retrieved from https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2013/july/documents/papa-francesco_20130728_gmg-rio.html.
- Reuters. (2024). Pope defends same-sex blessings declaration, says it is misunderstood. Retrieved from [Reuters](#)
- Schwartz, M. A., & Tatalovich, R. (2018). *The Rise and Fall of Moral Conflicts in the United States and Canada*. University of Toronto Press. http://books.google.ie/books?id=roBSDwAAQBAJ&pg=PA201&dq=same-sexrelations+as+a+contemporary+moral+issue&hl=&cd=2&source=gbs_api. Accessed 20 July 2024.
- The Standard. (2023). [State's moral stance against same-sex unions](#).
- The Star. (2023). [Church leaders' reactions to Kenya's LGBTQ ruling](#).
- Toribio Vazquez, J. L. (2020). “Nietzsche’s Shadow: On the Origin and Development of the term Nihilism. *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, 019145372097545. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0191453720975454>.
- Tuusvuori J.S. (2000). *Nietzsche & Nihilism Exploring a Revolutionary Conception of Philosophical Conceptuality*. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/14914981.pdf>.
- Urban, L., “William Ockham’s Theological Ethics.” *Journal of Franciscan Studies*, 33 (1973), 310–350. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/41974897.pdf?refreqid=fastly->

default%3A2df4c24545b3a53b3ebe6ef8db1e6a1d&ab_segments=&origin=&initiator=&acceptTC=1. Accessed 24/11/2023).

Vatican. (2021). *Statement on the Blessing of Same-Sex Unions*. Retrieved from https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20210315_r

Vozzola, E.C. "Moral Development: Theory and Applications" ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281674117_Moral_Development_Theory_and_Applications. Accessed on July 21, 2024.

Zive, G. (n.d). A Brief History of Western Homosexuality. <https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/honors/documents/journals/sexinstone/Zive.pdf>. Accessed July 20, 2024.

APPENDICES


Appendix I: NACOSTI Permit

REPUBLIC OF KENYA
NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY & INNOVATION

Ref No: 675948

Date of Issue: 24/April/2024

RESEARCH LICENSE




This is to Certify that Dr. LENNOXIE NAFUMA LUSABE of Chuka University, has been licensed to conduct research as per the provision of the Science, Technology and Innovation Act, 2013 (Rev.2014) in Tharaka-Nithi on the topic: **A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE CO-RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NIETZSCHE'S CONCEPT OF MORAL RELATIVISM AND SAME SEX SEXUAL RELATIONSHIP AS A CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISSUES** for the period ending : 24/April/2025.

License No: NACOSTIP/24/35036

675948
Applicant Identification Number

Director General
NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY & INNOVATION

Verification QR Code



NOTE: This is a computer generated license. To verify the authenticity of this document, Scan the QR Code using QR scanner application.

See overleaf for conditions